1	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA YAYGPAL COUNTY, ARIZONA					
2	FOR THE COUNTY OF YAVAPAI					
3	SANDRA K HARKHAM CLERK					
4	STATE OF ARIZONA,					
5	Plaintiff,					
6	vs.) Case No. V1300CR201080049					
7	JAMES ARTHUR RAY,					
8	Defendant.)					
9	<u>-</u>					
10						
11						
12						
13						
14	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS					
15	BEFORE THE HONORABLE WARREN R. DARROW					
16	TRIAL DAY THIRTY					
17	APRIL 8, 2011					
18	Camp Verde, Arizona					
19						
20						
21						
22	ORIGINAL					
23	REPORTED BY					
24 25	MINA G. HUNT AZ CR NO. 50619 CA CSR NO. 8335					

			1	1	INDE	3	
				2			
	1 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA		3	EXAMINATIONS	PAGE		
	2	FOR THE	COUNTY OF YAVAPAI	4	WITNESS		
	3			5	DEBRA J. MERCER		
	4	STATE OF ARIZONA,	}				
	5	Plaintiff,		6	Direct by Ms. Polk	38	
	6	vs.	Case No V1300CR201080049	_			
	7	JAMES ARTHUR RAY,		7			
	8	Defendant					
	9		_'	8	EXHIBITS A	DWILLED	
	10				Marine Lang.	N	
	11			9	Number F	Page	
	12			140	527 183		
	13			10	522 196		
		nenongen i o m	ONNOCOTOE OF PROCEEDINGS	144	672 204		
	14		RANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS	11			
	15		NORABLE WARREN R DARROW	10			
	16	TRI	AL DAY THIRTY	12			
	17	A	PRIL 8, 2011	40			
	18	Camp	Verde, Arizona	13			
	19			14			
	20			15			
	21			16			
	22			17			
	23			18			
	24		REPORTED BY MINA G HUNT	19			
			AZ CR NO 50619	20			
	25		CA CSR NO 8335	21			
			2	23 24 25			
1	APPEAR	ANCES OF COUNS		1	Proceedings had hefor	4 the Honorable	
2	For the	Plaintiff:		2	.		
3	V A V A	PAI COUNTY ATTO	DNEV'S OFFICE		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
J		SHEILA SULLIVAN		3	2011, at Yavapaı County Supe	erior Court, Division	
4	BY:	BILL R. HUGHES, A		4	Pro Tem B, 2840 North Comm	onwealth Drive,	
_		East Gurley		5	Camp Verde, Arızona, before	Mina G. Hunt. Certified	
5	Presc	cott, Arizona 8630	1-3868				
6				6	Reporter within and for the St	ate of Arizona.	
	For the	Defendant [.]		7			
7	T 0.1	446 K KELLY BO		8			
8		MAS K. KELLY, PC THOMAS K. KELLY,	ATTORNEY	9			
•		East Gurley	ATTORNET				
9		ott, Arizona 8630:	1-0001	10			
0		GER TOLLES & OLS		11			
1		LUIS LI, ATTORNEY TRUC DO, ATTORN		12			
	355 9	South Grand Avenu		13			
2		y-fifth Floor	00071 1560	14			
3	LOS A	ingeles, California	A00\1-1200	15			
	MUNG	GER TOLLES & OLS	ON, LLP	16			
4	BY.	MIRIAM L. SEIFTER	R, ATTORNEY				
_		Mission Street	- 04105 2007	17			
5	5an i	Francisco, California	3 94105-290/	18			
6				19			
7				20			
8 9				21			

PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: We're on the record. The defendant, Mr. Ray, is present. The attorneys are present.

And I wanted to talk a bit about legal

matters, particularly this 404(b) issue. That's what I'll call it. I do have the proposed instructions. I'll talk a bit about that. Although I'm not going to be giving it at the start of the day. But I think instructions should be given today regarding that.

But I --

1

2

4

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

24

25

1

10

11

19

20

21

22

Mr. Hughes, I have some questions -- I'll ask both counsel. 14

15 And, Mr. Kelly, I guess you're going to be addressing this for the defense, or Mr. Li? 16 17

MR. KELLY: Mr. Li is.

18 THE COURT: Thank you.

19 I recall that this ruling of the Court actually stemmed from March 1st. Isn't that 20 21 correct?

22 MR. HUGHES: That's the state's understanding, Your Honor. 23

THE COURT: And I noticed when I got the motion for reconsideration, it started with

attachments on the 9th, which is actually eight

2 days after the initial ruling that said that

evidence for causation purposes would be permitted.

I want to make sure that that's the case.

5 Does anybody have that March 1st transcript? Because it was not provided with the 6 7 motion for reconsideration.

8 MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, we've ordered that transcript, but I --9

THE COURT: I'm aware of that. And that's one you've ordered. I mean, Ms. Hunt told me you had 12 ordered the transcripts.

MR. HUGHES: We have. I don't think I've seen 13 the March 1st one yet. I think she may still be 14 15 working on that.

16 THE COURT: Okay. So the -- the point is 17 this: This is not some new ruling. I don't know 18 where that notion came about. It's not.

And there has not been any real challenge to that ruling until the motion for -- well, when the testimony came up with Mr. Mercer. That's, I think, an important aspect of chronology.

23 With regard to the instructions, we can talk a few minutes about that. Because I do think 24 25 it's important that a limiting instruction go to

1 the jury today sometime.

2 But there's another matter I want to comment too. And this goes to a concern that

4 Mr. Kelly brought up. In light of the testimony

5 yesterday, Mr. Hughes, I don't see that there would

be much need to have witnesses from other sweat

lodge ceremonies. The matter was covered in far

more detail -- far more detail than I had

9 anticipated.

10 And Mr. Kelly had brought up -- asked for some guidance about what about future witnesses. 11

12 And you mentioned the possibility of 15. And all I

could say is not cumulative. At this point it

would seem that almost any additional witness could

15 be cumulative.

25

13

14

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

6

16 MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, I think with any 17 witness, I think when you have testimony from one

witness, it's fair to have testimony that

19 corroborates that from at least one other witness,

20 Your Honor, before I think even the cumulative

21 specter raises its head. Otherwise the jury can

22 reject a witness's testimony based on either the

23 jury's consideration the witness may not recall

24 correctly or might have a bias.

So I think that cumulative would not

raise its head until at least after testimony by a

second witness or even a third witness. If the defense were to stipulate to certain facts, then

that would be less of an issue. But without --

without that the jury may reject some or all of

what Mr. Mercer said happened in prior years.

7 In addition, Mr. Mercer only talked about '07 and '08. And I think for purposes of showing the causation pattern, it would be appropriate to

10 have witnesses talk about '05 and '06. 11 We have been talking, and the prosecution

team, about exactly what witnesses we're going to be calling for those purposes. And we are cutting down the list guite a bit. We are going to ask -or plan to ask Mrs. Mercer, who's testifying today, some of the similar questions about prior years, I believe '07 and '08.

But, Your Honor, to cut short testimony on a relevant subject after only one witness has testified on the basis of cumulative, I think, would be improper merely because the jury needs to have something to gauge whether that testimony is accurate or not.

24 THE COURT: And I probably wasn't clear enough. I was anticipating that this witness, the

next witness, would be going to this as well. But that would actually make three witnesses that have discussed this area. And I don't think it's particularly contested matters.

5

7

8

9

10

11

24

25

1

2

3

4 5

7

8

9

10

11

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

It's -- the problem has been, in my view, largely the characterization. And I have a real concern in bringing in a lot of witnesses. What really can be conveyed there is an attempt to suggest propensity, not the specific factual issue that I found admissible with regard to causation back on March 1st when I made that determination.

12 Another thing I want to say about the witnesses too are the types of witnesses. I'm 13 14 going to use the term "Terrazas qualified." The 15 Mercers are essentially -- I've never heard that term before, but I think the attorneys know what I 16 mean by that. They were at the 404(b) hearing. I 17 made findings of clear and convincing evidence with 18 regard to however I characterized them in the 19 20 order -- unusual physical and mental health effects, that type of thing. They went through 21 the Terrazas process, and I made those findings. 22 23 Other people have not.

So to the extent 404(b) is the basis for admissibility, that's an important consideration.

MR. HUGHES: And, Your Honor, I agree. Although, again, the state is not offering the

evidence to prove a trait of character.

Ms. Hamilton is scheduled to testify next week. I believe she has some information about the 2005 incident. She went through the 404 hearing that occurred last year as well. But as of this point, there has been no testimony, for example, about the 2005.

It's not the state's intent to bring three or four or five witnesses about '05 or '06. 12 But I do think that it would be appropriate for 13 Ms. Hamilton, for example, to testify about the '05. I believe she has some information about the 14 '07 incident as well. And it would be appropriate 16 for her to testify about that.

If at that point the Court concludes that there's been enough testimony, for example, about '07 -- about the '07 event, by then the jury will have heard about '07 from Mr. Mercer, Mrs. Mercer today and then Ms. Hamilton next week. Obviously we'll respect the Court's ruling at that point regarding particular years.

24 But each year, I think, needs to be looked at separately because there were events in each of the separate years. And the fact that this

pattern bears out year after year after year, I

think, makes the pattern more relevant, which would

fall under the definition of "relevant evidence."

5 So it would be appropriate for the state to talk about the '05, which the jury hasn't heard 7 about, and to allow Mrs. Mercer today to talk about the '07 and '08, which she has knowledge of. She doesn't have knowledge, as far as we know, about 9 years prior to '07. 10

THE COURT: I just think we're getting close to being cumulative already.

Mr. Kelly.

11

12

13

19

21

23

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

14 MR. KELLY: Judge, I'll cut right to the chase. I would move to preclude any reference to sweat lodge events in 2007 and 2008 if it's 17 proffered by Debbie Mercer today on the basis that it's cumulative. Listening to Mr. Hughes, he said, 18 well, it's going to be similar to Mr. Mercer's by 20 definition. That's cumulative.

Secondly, under 403 any proffered 22 relevance is of minimal probative value and, as we saw yesterday, has the potential of a great deal of prejudice. And as set forth in the defense's limiting instruction attempting to contain that

10

prejudice, it presents significant legal problems.

2 So before Ms. Mercer takes the stand, Judge, I would move to preclude any reference to any event other than October of 2009 from

5 Ms. Mercer.

> MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, again, on that end, one, when you have testimony from one witness, it does not become cumulative when another witness provides testimony to corroborate the first witness. What becomes cumulative is when you have multiple witnesses down the road talking about the same thing.

We were very careful in our case in chief yesterday to go into very specific limited aspects of what happened in '07 and '08. If the Court recalls, it was during the cross-examination that a whole host of the photographs were brought out and there were questions about all sorts of other things, which really threw the barn doors wide open at that point in time.

But in our direct yesterday we were very narrow and very careful to bring out only limited information from Mr. Mercer.

THE COURT: And I understand what you're saying. And I also understand the defense's

approach. And that's -- people make those decisions.

1

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I want to say something about prejudice. 4 I mentioned this before. I think Mr. Li was the one that brought up the 403 aspect. And I have thought a great deal about that and the talk of prejudice in light of the evidence.

And I'm not commenting on the evidence, but the nature of the evidence that's been presented with regard to 2009, with regard to excerpts that were -- that were played, two to 12 three excerpts of recordings from Mr. Ray that were played to the jury during opening, and then one was played later. To consider what's been stated is prejudicial, especially at this point.

I do not find that it's prejudicial in light of the overall context. However, Mr. Hughes, at some point when it becomes a repetition, a repetition, it crosses over. And it's not offered anymore really for that limited purpose that is either acceptable under 404(b) or is offered for --

And when I say a non404(b) purpose, 23 that's what can get confusing. Are you talking about it being a nonpropensity purpose or -- so I don't think that's a clear enough term to use, as

given your rulings, as we understood them, Judge,

that you were going to allow the state limited --

with a great deal of caution, limited presentation 3

4 of prior incidents.

5 In our strategy we were left with a choice of what do we do now. Since by the end 7 of -- I believe it was Wednesday afternoon the jury 8 was left with an implication that the prior sweat 9 lodges, of which Mr. Mercer had attended -- left in 10 the minds of the jury of these horrible events, 11 which necessitated Mr. Li, then, admitting

12 photographs that we previously objected to.

13 And then -- and I take issue with 14 Mr. Hughes on redirect. And we filed the day prior 15 to yesterday. And beginning with Melissa Phillips' 16 redirect examination, I asked the Court to caution 17 the state from using a continued series of leading 18 questions on redirect. Yesterday afternoon 19 Ms. Polk went through a series of leading questions

20 on redirect, such as, did you see any vomiting

21 in 2008? Did you see anyone unconscious in 2008?

THE COURT: I don't think you were at the bench conference, Mr. Kelly. Because that was done 23

as a result of getting a characterization. So if

you weren't at the bench conference, you don't have

14

22

2

I've indicated.

But when it's offered for something that doesn't relate to 404(b), there's a basis for it that doesn't require a 404(b) analysis -- I looked at cases on that recently -- then that's a whole separate -- a whole separate question too. Mr. Kelly, you wanted to say something.

MR. KELLY: Judge, in regards to potential prejudice, I would submit that it is perhaps more complicated than simply referring to the references made in the opening statements by both sides.

And the examples I provide are the reference to Native American culture, the comparison between sweat lodges, between other events and JRI events.

I see a significant issue given Dr. Lyon and Dr. Cutshall's testimony when they talk about a continuum of heat between heat exhaustion and heat stroke. They're speaking of a physiological phenomenon, not an environmental phenomenon, which that physiological condition is specific to the ındıvidual.

22 23 And, of course, that was born out in 24 Mr. Li's cross-examination when necessarily he was 25 presented with the most difficult choice of --

a ground to be discussing that.

MR. KELLY: I was at the bench conference.

3 THE COURT: No. Because what --

4 MR. KELLY: Judge --

5 THE COURT: I need to address that, Mr. Kelly.

I need to address that. Because terms were coming

up like, did you see sick people? What does that

8 mean? Look at the instructions and the physical

effects that are anticipated. Is it sick? That

10 means -- can mean anything. And I have a problem

11 when you talk about medical distress and sickness.

12 So at the bench conference there was 13 really the instruction that be specific as to what the actual observations were. So that's where that 15 came from and -- I believe. If you're talking

16

about that series of leading questions by Ms. Polk, 17 I think that's where that derived from.

18 MS. POLK: Yes, Your Honor. It was actually 19 the Court's direction and counsel --

20 THE COURT: And Mr. Li --21

MS. POLK: -- requested it.

22 THE COURT: Yes. Mr. Li requested it be in

23 that fashion, Mr. Kelly. 24

MR. KELLY: Judge, my point is in regards to 25 403, one has to consider the cumulative nature of

20

- 1 the state's presentation on these issues.
- 2 THE COURT: That's what I said.
- MR. KELLY: And beginning with Ms. Phillips, 3
- 4 the very first witness, I asked for a cautionary
- instruction from the Court to prevent the state
- from improperly asking questions on redirect 6
- 7 examination, what has, our perspective, placed the
- defense in the untenable position of having to 8
- object in front of this jury repeatedly. Given
- 10 that, we filed a motion for prosecutorial
- 11 misconduct.

18

21

12 THE COURT: And we're not going to discuss 13 that, Mr. Kelly.

14 MR. KELLY: And what we're asking for, Judge,

is direction from the Court. We're asking for the 15

Court to admonish the State of Arizona to follow 16

the rules of evidence. Because many times the form 17

of the question, not the answer, is leaving an

19 impression in the jury's mind potentially which is

20 highly prejudicial to Mr. Ray. That's my point.

And if you take the sum total of this

information, whether it is what we call "back

dooring in 404(b)," improper character evidence; 23

the caution from the Court that any reference to

25 prior-act evidence should relate solely, in a very

- limited fashion, to causation, the actual causation
- 2 as it relates to physiology, and not environmental
- 3 temperatures, the comparison with Native American
- ceremonies, and then the repeated use of leading 4
- questions on redirect, improper foundation on 5
- direct and redirect -- the sum total of that is 6
- 7 presenting, in our mind, a great deal of prejudice
 - to our client.

8

16

17

9 And so we're asking for direction of the

10 Court. And I believe it's the Poole case from 1984

11 that emphasizes that -- you know -- there has to be

12 some orderly fashion and an impartial manner in

13 which the trial is conducted out of fairness to the

14 person charged with the alleged crime. And that's

15 what we're asking, Judge.

So I realize -- and I apologize for

getting off track this morning. Our request was

18 that the -- under 105 that the limiting instruction

19 be read to this jury before the next witness's

20 testimony. And, again, I would move to preclude

21 any additional testimony from Debbie Mercer in

22 regards to 2007, 2008.

23 Thank you.

24 THE COURT: Well, I just want to address that.

The photographs were brought in by the defense. 25

Some of them were taken by Debbie Mercer. There

was a lot of questioning about that. And we're

certainly at a point where there should not be a

great deal of testimony in this area about any

prior sweat lodges. I agree. I'll be attuned to

6 that.

18

24

13

17

23

7 But no. There can be -- that area has to

8 be -- well, it doesn't have to be. It may be

9 discussed if the state chooses to do that.

10 With regard to leading questions,

11 Mr. Kelly, I'll say this: I think the state

12 sometimes has chosen not to object, but there have

been a number of questions that have been presented

14 to the witnesses in a form that suggests knowledge

15 and then confirmation of knowledge rather than

16 really asking a question. The state has chosen not

17 to object. And I'll just note that.

I will certainly encourage, again, when

19 questions are asked of witnesses, especially in

20 these areas where there's not going to be a retrial

21 of prior sweat lodges -- and because of that

22 sometimes there's necessarily a leading nature to a

23 question so it doesn't just go anywhere.

But the questions need to be phrased with

25 602 in mind. Is this witness really going to know

18

something? Is there going to be a question thrown

out there that leads anywhere despite the basis of

knowledge? Or is there going to be a leading

question that really plants the seed as to -- you

5 know -- what a person might be drawn to as opposed

to just saying this is really an observation that

7 the person really has observed?

8 But we can only spend a few minutes. I

know -- in terms of reading the instructions -- I

10 got them just this morning. I've looked at them

11 both, and they're far different in nature.

12 The Rule 105 requires a reading upon

request, and there's a request made and a specific 14 instruction provided.

15 So, Mr. Hughes, I think the defense has

you would, please, if you're going to address it.

requested it, and I think you should respond, if

18 MR. HUGHES: Thank you, Your Honor.

19 Rule 105 does require a limiting

20 instruction upon request. It doesn't require a

21 limiting instruction as drafted by the defendant.

22 105 does say that the Court shall restrict the

evidence to its proper scope and instruct the jury

24 accordingly.

25 The defendant's proposed limiting

- 1 instruction, the first section, first of all, is
- 2 confusing. It is referring to an evidentiary
- 3 ruling the Court made at a hearing that took place
- outside the presence of the jury. But it appears
- 5 to be a comment on the evidence that's been
- 6 presented here in court. It's confusing. It
- 7 invades the province of the jury as far as
- determining the weight that evidence that they've 8
- 9 heard in this court should be given.

With respect to 105, 105 talks about limiting evidence in scope. And to do that, really the instruction needs to limit the scope and not explain the background. Although I think a little bit of background -- for example, in the state's proposed instruction, we included the evidence is

16 relevant only for limited purposes. 17 So you can give the jury a little

18 background. But the first paragraph of the defendant's proposed instruction is confusing 19

because it's referring to an evidentiary hearing

21 that the jury doesn't know about, but it appears

22 and would appear to jurors to be referring or

23

commenting on evidence in this case. 24

With respect to the second part of the defendant's proposed instruction, the second

paragraph, it goes far beyond the scope that 105

would permit, which is the proper scope of the

3 evidence.

10

11

12

13

14

15

25

1

4 The Court has ruled that the prior sweat

5 lodge evidence can come in to -- on the issue of

6 causation, why the victims died. And that's

7 appropriate. And the jury should be instructed

8 that. Really it should end appropriately right

9 there.

10

11

12

14

15

16

18

19

20

The defense wanted the other side in their instruction and -- as far as what they can't consider it for. And the Court has ruled that we cannot use that evidence for 404(b) purposes. 13 404(b) is character evidence. And it starts out -that's precisely what 404(b) says. It cannot be used to prove the character of a person. And

17 that's what the jury cannot use that evidence for.

But, for example, to say that the jury can't consider how Mr. Ray acted, I think, ignores

that and -- in prior years. That ignores his role

21 in the past, in prior years. And that's not 22

evidence of his propensity. It's evidence that

23 there's a pattern. And you have to look at that

pattern. You look at how other sweat lodges at 24

Angel Valley -- how did they act and how did

1 Mr. Ray act.

2 It's the act, the testimony is, of the

3 pourer of controlling the heat, controlling the

4 amount of humidity, controlling the length. That's

what leads to the causation. So, for example, to

say that they can't consider it to determine how he

7 acted on those prior occasions not only misstates

the evidence but it --

9 THE COURT: You know -- I -- what do you mean

10 how he acted? Why -- you're saying it can be used

11 to -- how he acted in terms of characterizing as

12 improper conduct?

13 MR. HUGHES: The jury -- the defense has asked

14 in the instruction that they can't use that

15 evidence or consider how Mr. Ray may have acted or

16 what his conduct was in the past. The reason this

17 evidence is relevant is it does show a pattern

18 which establishes causation.

19 And the pattern is that the pourer

20 controls the heat. The pourer controls the length

21 of the session. The pourer controls how many rocks

22 come in. Those are all acts, the controlling of

23 the length of the session.

The proposed instruction informs the jury

they can't consider that. And then that would

22

24

6

12

leave this pattern meaningless because the pattern

then would -- the pattern shows or is based upon

the fact that the pourer, who's in charge of the

ceremony, controls the outcome of the conditions

5 inside that sweat lodge as far as causation.

THE COURT: Mr. Li.

7 MR. LI: Your Honor, I think it's critical to

note that when we first -- first of all, the Court

is correct. It did mention the causation issue in

March, on March 1st. And our papers noted that. 10

11 We just didn't have a transcript for that.

But as I hear the state's recitation of

13 the admissible -- you know -- the reason why all of

14 these prior sweat lodges are admissible, I hear the

15 word "pattern" over and over and over again.

16 And, Your Honor, with all due respect,

17 pattern is propensity. Pattern is saying that a

18 man acted in one way in one year and is acting in

conformity therewith in subsequent years. That is

20 actually directly prescribed by 404 -- Rule 404.

21 One issue I do -- I do want to note is

22 that Mr. Hughes says that 404 only has to do with

23 character. Actually, it's 404(a) that is the

character evidence issue. 404(b) is actually the

part that we're talking about here, which is that 25

you cannot use prior acts to show actions in
 conformity therewith except for under very narrow
 circumstances. And those narrow circumstances are
 set out in Rule 404(b). And that was the subject
 of the Court's ruling in -- on February 3rd, 2011.
 What I think is critical in why this

What I think is critical in why this instruction is so important is the Court is -- and the state has suggested that there's something different and that there's a way that you can introduce this evidence to demonstrate causation that's somehow different than pattern evidence.

THE COURT: Mr. Li, if you're talking about a 404(b) exception, that is always the case. That evidence has a real danger to it. And you have to have an instruction. You have to limit that other evidence to the extent you can.

MR. LI: I agree.

7

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

20

21

25

2

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

18 THE COURT: So I think -- is that what you're 19 talking about?

MR. LI: Yeah. Your Honor, I'm not going to argue the motion for reconsideration.

22 THE COURT: Good.

23 MR. LI: That's in our papers. And we don't 24 have time to do that. We've issued our papers.

The only reason why I bring it up is

because we -- the Court itself has identified and agreed that we are treading on dangerous grounds

3 and that -- you know -- the Court said there's no

4 doubt about that.

This could take us right into the 404(b)
area the way the state's articulating it's theory.
You know, Mr. Ray did it in one way in 2007;

8 therefore, he must have done it the same way

9 in 2009. We are -- we are sliding directly into

10 that area.

And the reason why it's important that we have a very firm limiting instruction is to avoid exactly the dangers that the Court agrees with, the dangerous ground that we are treading on.

And so, for instance, our instruction goes directly to what is not permissible under 404(b), which is, in fact, the Court's ruling. It is not permissible to use any of the prior acts to draw any inference regarding Mr. Ray's knowledge of any risk of death in 2009. That is exactly the Court's ruling. That is directly in line with 404(b).

They may not consider evidence regarding sweat lodge ceremonies to demonstrate Mr. Ray's intent, character, or conduct in 2009. Again, directly pulled from the Court's ruling and therule itself, Rule 404(b).

It also prohibits -- under Rule 404(b)

and the Court's ruling, it also prohibits the jury

from drawing an inference that any person who acted

in a certain manner on one occasion is likely to do

so again. That's drawn directly from Rule 404(b).

And the only purpose that the state now purports is actually a valid reason to causation.

And that is you may only consider evidence from those prior sweat lodges, if believed, as it may relate to whether the state has proven beyond a reasonable doubt that the decedents died of heat stroke and not a different cause.

That is exactly the theory that the state
is now proffering these prior sweat lodge events
under. They are saying, look. The tarps were the
same. We don't agree with that. But the tarps
were the same. The wood was, basically, the same.
Everything was the same. Therefore, you can
reasonably conclude that these deaths were caused

by heat stroke and not by some other cause. Andthat's exactly what this limiting instruction says.

24 It also establishes that it's not -- the

state has to prove this. You know. We have this

1 conversation -- I mean, we had a sidebar at one

2 point where I made an objection about the

3 burden-shifting issue where, I believe, Mr. Hughes

4 asked the doctor whether Ms. Do had shown him any

5 evidence. That's actually -- it's actually the

6 state's burden. And I think that the jury needs to

7 be reminded that the state must prove everything

8 beyond a reasonable doubt.

And so this instruction hues very closely to not only Rule 404(b) but the Court's ruling of February 3rd, 2011. And it's critical that be given because what's happening is the evidence is getting --

THE REPORTER: The evidence is getting?
MR. LI: Well, it's a good chance to use a
different word.

The evidence is getting conflated and combined into an unidentifiable mess. And it's up to the Court to -- well, and what I mean by that, Your Honor, is that --

THE COURT: Again, I'm thinking about everything that came in the opening and all the other evidence. And I'm just puzzled by that.

24 Go ahead.

MR. LI: Your Honor, I apologize by the

25

9

10

11

12

13

21

22

23

15

17

1 characterization of it.

2 THE COURT: Well, I see a lot of 3 characterization in things that get filed. And,

believe me. I'm going to only look at the substance. And --

6 MR. LI: I appreciate that.

doesn't raise the Court's ire.

7 THE COURT: -- you can characterize it how you 8 wish.

9 MR. LI: I appreciate that, Your Honor. And I will attempt to characterize it in a way that 10

The point I'm trying to make here is that 13 the evidence has come in in a way that is not clear 14 for what purpose it can and should be used. And 15 there are -- there are -- and the way the state has articulated its theory as pattern is actually impermissible.

And so what must happen is that there needs to be an instruction in which the evidence -in which the jury is told what it can do and what it cannot do. And if it doesn't do that, if we 22 don't have that instruction, then we'll -- we'll 23 have the state arguing that there's a pattern. 24 Therefore, it must have been -- Mr. Ray must have

been guilty. That is exactly what 404(b)

prohibits.

note that.

use of that evidence.

11

12

16

17

18

19

20

21

1

10

22

2 THE COURT: And what I'm going to do -- we 3 need to start with the jury -- is I'm going to request that both of you look at the 404(b) ruling 5 and look at the discussion that relates -- the medical effects, if you call them that, or physical 6 7 effects, with the manner in which sweat lodges were 8 conducted. There was a Terrazas finding with 9 regard to that as well. I'll just -- I'll just

11 But the way I see this, Mr. Hughes, is this instruction would, essentially, permit the 12 state to argue things that cannot be argued on the 13 14 basis of this evidence of causation. And whether 15 it comes in as an exception under 404(b) with 16 witnesses who so far have actually been Terrazas 17 qualified and there's actually -- and there's been 18 sufficient notice and there's been no -- nothing 19 until -- from March 1st until very recently until 20 there's any problem; or whether it's somehow some 21 other basis, this would not, would not, confine the

23 With regard to the defense instruction, 24 it's accurate with regard to the rulings. It's accurate. The concern I have, Mr. Hughes,

is what you've raised, is at what point, though, does it really cross over and do more the other 3 wav?

4 So an instruction needs to go today. I agree it's gone on. But I don't want to put it out 6 a bad instruction. That may be a process. It may 7 be an initial instruction and then refining it.

8 The Hartford case that was cited where 9 there was a Rule 20 -- no. I'm sorry. That wasn't 10 the case. But there was actually a Rule 20 granted 11 on a serious charge, and the jury was instructed to 12 disregard all the evidence on that charge.

It's important to have an appropriate 14 instruction. And I'll just say that I do think it needs to have detail along the lines of what the defense has proposed. I have a concern, though, Mr. Hughes. I'll note that.

18 So the other -- I did want to mention 19 something. I believe I need to bring this up. In 20 cross-examining Mr. Mercer, there was a question 21 about whether or not Mr. Mercer had concerns about 22 the way Mr. Ray was conducting ceremonies. Both 23 sides recall that question.

24 Mr. Li, you objected, and I sustained it. And then there was some follow up, though, that

30 1 asked about his level of encouraging -- and I don't

> believe there was an objection to that -- comparing if he encouraged people more. And there was

another question about other facilitators and

leaving the door open and checking on other

participants. And I don't think there was an

objection there. And that kind of questioning gets

8 a lot into somehow suggesting bad conduct. 9

So I'd like -- I want to get the jury called and -- really we need to do that. But is there any other anticipated evidentiary issue that's specific? I don't want to start and have a bench conference three minutes into the testimony.

14 MR. HUGHES: I'm not aware of anything, Your 15 Honor.

16 THE COURT: Mr. Kelly?

17 MR. KELLY: I don't mean to be -- with all candor, Judge, I have a great deal of concern as it 19 relates to forms of the question.

THE COURT: And I'm going to address that, Mr. Kelly. Thank you. Please sit down.

I just -- I've pointed out there are times when leading is sometimes necessary, especially when there's been some -- some pretrial or out-of-the-presence-of-the-jury motion practice.

10

11

13

20

21

22

23

24

1 I'm again asking that people be conscious of 602 and the basis for the question and that there not be improper leading. Everyone knows the rules. Both sides know those rules apply. I'll just restate them for everybody's benefits.

Ms. Polk.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. POLK: Your Honor, I'm aware of that. The issue arises when the defense in cross-examination, as the Court has noted, suggests to the jury that the evidence is something other than it is. And in examining Mr. Mercer over the last couple of days, I was very, very careful to limit his testimony in

accordance with the Court's ruling. The defense then came in with photographs that I had not introduced, trying to suggest something other than what had actually occurred. And specifically I want to note that Mr. Li asked Mr. Mercer a question and Mr. Mercer responded, no. I was not surprised with what happened in 2009. That was opening the door. I was very careful -- I chose not to go back and say to Mr. Mercer, why were you not surprised? And so there are many opportunities where the defense opens doors or deliberately makes the evidence --

34

14

16

24

25

1

that it does not. And it dangles out there. And I 2 know the Court is aware of a couple of other 3 occasions where that has happened and the Court has 4 not allowed the state to go back there.

suggests that the evidence stands for something

Yesterday I chose not to go back there, even though, in my opinion, they are mischaracterizing the evidence deliberately. And then we either don't get to go back there or I need to choose not to go back there.

But I'm very aware of the Court's order. Again, with Mr. Mercer I was very careful to limit what came in. And it was really through the cross-examination that a lot more information came ın.

THE COURT: Well, Ms. Polk, if there's something objectionable, you have to object. I don't think you can not object and then just go into an area and say it's been opened when it's objectionable. I think that's an issue.

So if you need to object, object.

MS. POLK: And, Your Honor, I'm not saying -if the defense chooses to further explore what happened in 2007 and 2008, the state is not going to object. However, they then have opened that area for the state to go -- and the perfect example

is those photographs that I did not introduce, they introduced. And so then I was appropriate in going 3 back over those photographs.

4 THE COURT: And I thought that recross in a 5 specific -- particular point happened to be 6 important. It was, I think, a very important area.

7 But I wasn't thinking of that particular 8 area in terms of the objection. But if you -- if 9 you think that there's something you should have 10 objected to, then I think that needs to be done.

11 And I don't need to comment beyond that. 12 Mr. Kelly, very briefly.

13 MR. KELLY: Ms. Polk's comment exemplifies the problem, Judge. The evidence is not what the State of Arizona believes it is, and it is not what we think it is.

17 The facts are what are elicited from the 18 witnesses on the stand. And yet repeatedly we're 19 accused of some type of misconduct when all we've 20 done is point out to this jury that there's been an 21 inadequate investigation and their doctors cannot 22 testify to a reasonable degree of medical certainty 23 as to the cause of death --

> THE COURT: Mr. Kelly, if you don't mind --MR. KELLY: -- acknowledge. So --

THE COURT: Excuse me. We're not going to

have argument right now on various things. Both

sides -- and I've really had enough of the

argument, any finger-pointing. 5

MR. KELLY: I agree.

6 THE COURT: I'm going to listen to questions. 7 I'm going to make the best rulings I can. But we're not going to sit here and just argue. We're going to be moving ahead with the case.

9 10

I do want to comment to the state. 11 Mr. Hughes, you said something about months. As I look at this, it would seem to me at

the outside the case should be presented in the

14 next three weeks, maybe two weeks. Three weeks at

15 the outside for the state's case. That's my

16 general view of this. I'm just saying that's my 17 observation.

18 But to say that there are months to go or 19 something, I have a concern about that. And I certainly am going to be reasonable. And people 21 have to be able to present the cases. I understand 22 that. But I got concerned when I -- when I heard 23 the term "months."

24 But one thing is we're going to get this on a basis that we're not going to have extensive

Page 37 to 40 of 210

37

39

10 of 53 sheets

5

6

10

14

18

19

1

9

18

- It's in between Sun City and Wickenburg on Grand Avenue.
 - Q. How did you hear about Angel Valley?

2

3

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

4 I think I picked up a brochure at one 5 point, and then I checked it out on the Internet. 6 And then at one point Ted and I became interested 7 in real estate and we thought we wanted to live in 8 Sedona until we found Cottonwood.

9 But we were coming up looking at real 10 estate. And that one time we stopped and looked at 11 Angel Valley and then started going -- actually not 12 on the property. We would go on the other side of the creek where the campsites were and the parking 13 14 area. It wasn't until probably 2006 that we 15 actually went on the property and talked to the 16 people there.

Q. To get to the area on the other side of the creek to the campsites, is it the same road as to get to Angel Valley?

A. Yes. When you go down the road, you get down to the curve, and then here's a gate for Angel Valley. And if you went straight, it takes you to forest service land where there's individual campsites, but it's right up the creek from there. And you can go the other way too.

Q. Okay. And we heard that you and your husband started volunteering at Angel Valley. Do you recall how that came about?

A. Well, we had been going -- visiting there. And we noticed that the grounds seemed to have -- you know -- when we first started going there, the grounds were real nice and it was beautiful.

And over the course of a period of time, it seemed like it went down hill. There was a lot of weeds and trees, and it looked like things needed to be done. So we said, do you guys need help cleaning up the place -- you know. And that's how it started.

15 Q. Why did you want to volunteer to help 16 clean up Angel Valley?

> Α. It was just a nice place to be.

Who did you talk to, if you recall, when you made that first arrangement to volunteer there?

Initially we talked to a lady named Katherine and another girl, Katie.

Q. What sorts of things, then, did you do when were you volunteering at Angel Valley?

A. We did a lot of weeding. We just weeded it and took down trees on the property that -- you

1 know -- needed to be taken down, and painted

benches and whatever they needed to be done.

3 Sometimes it was cleaning out a closet or a storage

4 area. Things like that.

Q. Who did you take direction from when you did the weeding or the landscaping work?

7 Initially it was just the girls in the 8 office -- Katie or Katherine.

9 And then did you meet Michael and Amayra

11 Α. Yes. But we never took direction from 12 them really.

13 Q. You worked indirect --

Hamilton at some point?

Α. Through the office. Yeah.

15 Q. During the time that you were volunteering and you were doing weeding on the

17 property, tell the jury how you did weeding.

We sat on the ground and picked them up by hand.

20 **Q.** Did you ever use any chemicals to take 21 care of the weeds?

22 Α. No. We used our hands. And they gave 23 us -- I think they call it a "hula hoe." But they 24 were kind of useless. It was easier to just do it

sitting down and picking them.

42

Q. Where are the areas that you weeded?

2 Α. We weeded all around the cabins and the canoes -- I mean the -- canoes. Teepees. Anywhere that -- anywhere there was an area that they asked

5 us to weed.

6 Q. Ms. Mercer, I'm going to put up on the 7 overhead Exhibit 140 and just ask you first if you recognize what that is a little map of?

A. Yes, I do. It's Angel Valley property.

10 **Q.** And just show the jury the different 11 areas that you weeded when you were volunteering.

12 Well, I don't know if I would remember 13 every area. But I know initially we weeded all 14 around these cabins, the bath houses, Crystal 15 Hall -- you know.

16 Are you talking just when we initially

17 were volunteering?

Q. Yes.

19 A. Then I would say that those are the 20 areas. We did some -- worked by this teepee over 21

here and -- oh. No. Not that teepee. Oh, yeah.

22 That teepee. And this teepee. That's the one I 23 was thinking of.

24 **Q.** And at some point your husband actually became employed at Angel Valley?

11 of 53 sheets

8

11

21

25

46

- 1 A. Yes.
- **Q.** Do you recall when that was?
- 3 A. Officially, I believe March.
- **Q.** Of what year?
- 5 A. 2008.
- 6 Q. And up until March between -- in 2000 do
- 7 you know -- do recall what month in 2007 you first
- 8 started volunteering at Angel Valley?
- 9 A. I think it was in the summer. It was,
- 10 like, July. Like -- so we'd been going there
- 11 before that. But I think we started volunteering
- 12 in July.

25

1

- 13 Q. Then from July of 2007, when you first
- 14 started volunteering, to March of 2008, when your
- 15 husband got employment there, give the jury an idea
- 16 of how often it was that you were on the property
- 17 doing volunteer work.
- 18 A. Before -- we'd come up as often as they'd
- 19 let us when -- if they had an open cabin. Because
- 20 at that point we didn't have a place to stay. So
- 21 it was when they had an open cabin. So every
- 22 weekend if they had a cabin available.
- **Q.** When your husband took employment in
- 24 March of 2008, were you working?
 - A. Working at Health Insurance Solutions?
 - Q. Yes. Working outside of the volunteer
- 2 work you were doing at Angel Valley?
- 3 A. Yes. I always had a full-time job at
- 4 Health Insurance Solutions. When he started --
- 5 when he started at Angel Valley working there, we
- 6 had a trailer that we got moved up there and
- 7 rented. And when that -- when we did that, then I
- 8 would work at my office Monday, Tuesday, and
- 9 Wednesday. And I'd leave Wednesday evening and
- 10 drive up to Angel Valley. And then I'd work at
- 11 Angel Valley Thursday, Friday, Saturday, Sunday and
- 12 then drive back Monday morning and work at Health
- 13 Insurance Solutions.
- 14 Q. You just said that you would work at
- **15** Angel Valley for the latter part of the week. What
- 16 were you doing at Angel Valley when you were
- 17 working there?

18

- A. At that point, once Ted was hired there,

 I did a lot of the housekeeping, management more,
- 20 making sure there was enough beds ready for the21 groups that were coming.
- 22 So, in other words, I would see the
- 23 calendar of the groups that were coming and how
- 24 many people were coming, how many boys and girls,
- 25 and where -- to put them in what cabins and to make

- sure they had -- you know -- all the stuff they
- 2 needed in the room and just to supply things for
- 3 the groups that were coming beforehand.
- 4 And then when they got, we would -- I
- 5 would set up different events or activities for the
- 6 groups as they were called for.
 - Q. Were you on the payroll at Angel Valley?
 - A. Never.
- **9 Q.** Were you getting paid when you did all of
- 10 the duties that you just described?
 - A. Never.
- **12 Q.** That was done in connection with your
- 13 husband and his employment there?
- 14 A. I was volunteering. They had said they
- 15 were going to hire me -- you know. It was always,
- 16 yeah. We're going to make a place -- you know --
- 17 to pay you. But they never did.
- 18 Q. After your husband took employment there,
- 19 did you and he continue to do landscaping or
- 20 weeding on the property?
 - A. Yes.
- **Q.** Did you continue to do landscaping or
- 23 weeding on the property through 2009, or through
- 24 October, the end of October 2009?
 - A. I did. But that wasn't my primary. You
 - 48
- 1 know, at that point I was more in the people end of
- 2 it -- you know -- the housekeeping end, the group
- 3 end. So I didn't have that much to do with the
- 4 grounds other than setting up tents. Like, when
- 5 the James Ray International group comes, we have to
- 6 set up additional tents.
- 7 So I did that or cleaned the area around
- 8 the tents and that. But I didn't do much weeding
- 9 or landscaping after that.
- 10 Q. Show the jury on this map where the tents
- 11 are that you just described that you would set up
- 12 for Mr. Ray's events.
- 13 A. There -- well, the additional tents we've
- 14 set up are on the ones over here on the other side
- 15 of the creek. All these. And then there's some
- 16 over here, some right here as well. And then for
- 17 him we put them everywhere. They had to have
- 18 sleeping for, I believe it was, 75, and in tents or
- 19 cabins.
- 20 Q. You talked about cleaning the area around
- 21 those tents when you would set them up. What did
- 22 you do to clean the area around the tents?
- A. Picked the weeds up and used the shovels
- 24 and turned over the dirt and stuff.
 - Q. And then you talked about taking down

52

- 1 trees on the property?
- 2 A. Uh-huh.
- 3 Q. How did you take down trees?
 - A. With saws. Just the little trees. You know, the ones that pop up really fast.
- Q. Can you show on the map, show the jury
 all the areas that you tended to in terms of taking
 care of weeds or doing any landscaping between 2007
 and 2009.
- 10 A. Any area that I may have done
 11 landscaping -- that would be the whole property.
 12 Not the swimming areas, but -- oh. This is a -13 this over here is a blow-up of this area. Okay. I
 14 was right. I got confused.
- **15 Q.** Did you --
- 16 A. It would be the whole property, I would 17 think.
- 18 Q. You performed landscaping services on the19 whole property?
- A. I would imagine. I mean, I can't
 remember doing landscaping at each specific area.
 But I would say yes.
- Q. And at any time between the time you
 first started volunteering at Angel Valley through
 the time that you left toward the end of 2009, did
 - you ever use any chemicals or any herbicides of any
- 2 type in doing the landscaping or weed eating?
- 3 A. No. No. We did not.
- Q. Can I ask you, Ms. Mercer -- you justindicated some tents that got set up over on this
- 6 side?

1

- 7 A. Yes.
- Q. How do participants get from the AngelValley -- how do you get across the creek to get to
- 10 those tents?
- 11 A. There's a bridge.
- 12 Q. Did you ever use any poisons at Angel
- 13 Valley?
- 14 A. No. Like -- no. There was a rat in the 15 kitchen once, and we had to get a live trap. No.
- 16 We were not allowed to use poisons or pesticides or
- 17 chemicals. It was a very natural place.
- 18 I had to do the shopping for the laundry, 19 and we had to get all pure, natural stuff to do the 20 laundry.
- 21 Q. Do you -- you just mentioned a rat in the 22 kitchen one time. Do you recall when that was?
- 23 A. No. It was cold. I don't remember.
- **Q.** And how did you get involved in taking
- **25** care of a rat that was in the kitchen?

- A. I tried not to get involved. I didn't --
- 2 I just knew there was one there. And I think Ted
- 3 wanted to use -- you know -- one of those strip
- 4 things. I don't know what they are. But he wanted
- 5 to use something, and Amayra said, absolutely not.
- 6 And then management said we could only use live
- 7 traps. Then what do you do with it? And that
- 8 was --
- **9 Q.** Do you recall if it was caught?
- 10 A. No. I think the cat -- I think the cat
- 11 took care of it actually. Because there was two
- 12 cats on the property. And that was my suggestion
- 13 is to get the cats in there. I think that we let
- 14 the cats in the area. And -- I don't remember what
- 15 happened actually.
- **Q.** Okay. Prior to your becoming -- prior to
- 17 your having a relationship or visiting the Angel
- 18 Valley property, had you ever been in a sweat lodge
- 19 before?

21

25

1

- 20 A. No. I've never been in a sweat lodge.
 - Q. Have you ever been in a sweat lodge?
- 22 A. I've never been in a sweat lodge.
- **Q.** Prior to 2007 did you know what a sweat
- 24 lodge was?
 - A. No.
 - Q. And in 2007 did you have -- did you come
 - 2 to learn about sweat lodges?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. And how?
- 5 A. The first one would be the James Ray
- 6 International event in 2007.
- 7 Q. How was it that you came to be involved
- 8 in that event, Mr. Ray's sweat lodge in 2007?
- 9 A. They asked us to help out with the event.
- 10 Q. Who's "they"?
- 11 A. Angel Valley management. I mean, in
- 12 2007 -- yeah. They just asked us. We weren't
- 13 there, and they asked us to come up. We stayed
- 14 in the trailer.
- 15 Q. And at that time were you working for
- 16 Angel Valley?
- 17 A. No. I mean, not officially -- I mean,
- 18 they counted on us. If they needed something, they
- 19 knew they could call on us, and we'd come up and do
- 20 it. But we weren't officially -- we were still
- 21 volunteers.
- **Q.** Between 2007 and 2009, then, did you
- 23 assist in some sweat lodge ceremonies at Angel
- 24 Valley?
- 25 A. Several.

- Q. How many?
- 2 Α. I'm guessing 8 or 10.
- 3 Q. And are some of those 8 or 10? Were they
- 4 ceremonies performed by Mr. Ray?
 - Three. Α.
- 6 Q. Do you remember how many you assisted
- 7 with or had something to do with in 2007?
- 8 James was at the end of the year,
- September. We may have done one or two after that 9
- in 2007. I can't recall specifically. 10
- And you just said "James." Did you mean 11 Q.
- 12 Mr. Ray?

5

- 13 Α. I'm sorry. James Ray.
- 14 Q. It's okay. I just wanted to ask you,
- 15 when did you meet Mr. Ray?
- 16 Α. I've never been introduced to him. I've
- 17 seen him on the property and was told beforehand
- 18 you weren't supposed to go up and talk to him.
- 19 Q. And --
- 20 Α. He's spoken to me on the property.
- 21 When you assisted with that first sweat
- lodge ceremony, the one put on by Mr. Ray, did you
- 23 know what to expect?
- Α. 24 No.
- 25 Q. For Mr. Ray's first ceremony, for the
 - first one you assisted with in September of 2007,
- 2 did you have a role?
- 3 I was, basically, assisting. I was
- brushing the rocks most of the time and helping the 4
- 5 fire keeper.
- 6 Q. Did somebody train you?
- 7 Α.
- 8 Q. Who was in charge of that ceremony? Do
- 9 you recall?

11

21

- 10 Α. What do you mean "in charge"?
 - Q. Well, who was telling you what to do,
- 12 since this was your first?
- 13 Α. Oh. Gary. Gary Palish.
- 14 And do you know what Gary Palish's role
- at Angel Valley was? 15
- 16 I believe he was the general manager.
- 17 You just said to the jury you assisted
- 18 with some rocks. Explain to the jury, first of
- 19 all, what you understood your role for that
- 20 September 2007 sweat lodge to be.
 - Α. As the fire tender would take the rocks
- 22 out of the fire, he would bring them over to an
- 23 area where we would brush them off with a whisk
- 24 broom. And then it would be handed off to a person 25
 - who took it into the sweat lodge and then handed

- off to the other person who would put them in the
- middle of the lodge.
 - Q. And your role was what?
- 4 To brush off the rocks and hand them to
- 5 the person in the sweat lodge.
 - The pitchfork came to you from somebody?
- 7 Well, yeah. Pitchfork or a shovel.
- 8 Uh-huh.

3

6

9

18

21

- Q. And --
- 10 Α. It would usually transfer -- the fire
- 11 keeper would take it out with his pitchfork or
- 12 shovel and it would come onto the rock. And then
- the next person would come over with a fork or a 13
- 14 shovel and pick it up after it was brushed off and
- then hand it off into the sweat lodge.
- 16 Were you doing any of the hand-offs into
- 17 the sweat lodge?
 - Α. Yes.
- 19 Q. You were also brushing them off?
- 20 Α. Yes.
 - Q. How was it that you would do both?
- 22 Because you switch off. Because one
- 23 person -- depending on how many rocks you take --
- you know -- you -- there would be a motion. So one
- 25 person would be putting a rock in while the fire
- tender is getting another rock out and brushing it
- 2 off. So it would rotate.
- 3 Q. About how long does it take to get ten
- rocks into a sweat lodge using that system that you
- 5 just described for the jury?
- 6 It depends. Because each time you have
- 7 to uncover rocks. And it's hot. So it -- you
- know -- it depends on how long it takes the fire
- tender to get the rocks out of the fire.
- 10 Approximately five or six minutes, maybe
- 11 eight.
- 12 Q. To get about ten rocks in a sweat lodge?
- 13 Α. Yeah.
- 14 Q. And in 2007, then, did you have any other
- 15 role other than brushing off rocks and then getting
- 16 them to the door of the sweat lodge?
- 17 A. I'm not -- during the sweat lodge -- I
- 18 mean, then people would come out and we would
- 19 get -- I would get them water or try and cool them 20 off or clean their faces off.
- 21 And let me ask you this: Before that
- 22 ceremony started had somebody instructed you to
- 23 take care of participants as they came out?
 - Α. No. And we were kind of shocked by that
- 25 and --

24

Page 53 to 56 of 210

what round it was.

58

2

11

20

your attention was drawn to?

Let's talk generally, then, about near

3 the -- during the first few rounds of Mr. Ray's

ceremony, was your attention drawn to a specific 4

5 person?

1

2

6 Α. Yes. At the beginning.

7 Q. And what about that person drew your

8 attention?

9 Α. A woman was exiting the sweat lodge, and

10 she appeared to be having difficulty getting out.

11 And as she got to the door, she tried to stand up,

12 and she went flat on her face in the sand moving

13 forward.

14

Q. Did you go to her?

15 Α. Yes.

16 Q. And what did you do once you went to her?

17 I turned her over. And her -- do I go

18 on?

19 Q. Yes.

20 A. I turned her over, and her eyes were

21 fluttering back in the head -- she had the most

22 beautiful blue eyes. And they were fluttering back

in her head. And her tooth was broken or chipped, 23

24 and she had blood on the side of her face.

What did you do, then, to the -- to the 25

1

A. A guy came out. Yes.

3 Okay. And do you recall when in the

4 ceremony this second person that you're thinking

of -- when your attention was drawn to him?

6 A. I believe it was at the end of the lodge.

7 Q. Was it before it was over or after the

ceremony was over? 8

9 A. I can't recall. I think it was after. I

10 can't recall.

> Q. Okay. And is this a man or woman?

12 A. A man.

13 And tell the jury -- limiting it to what

14 you personally saw or heard, tell the jury what you

15 saw or heard.

16 Α. He wanted me -- he asked me to get him to

17 the water. He said he had a heart condition and

18 his heart was scaring him and he wanted to get to

19 the water and cool off.

> Q. What was his demeanor?

21 A. He was somewhat panicked and wanted me to

22 get him there very quickly. He had no shoes on,

23 and he was just walking through sticks and things

24 that should have hurt his feet. But -- I mean, I

would think they would hurt his feet. But he was

64

2 wanted to get to that water quickly.

- Q. And what did you do?
- Α. I got him to the water.
 - How did you get him to the water? Q.
- 6 A. We just plowed our way through the --
- 7 through the area. I mean, there's not really a
- path. So, like I said, we were -- because the --8
- 9 the creek is there. But when it floods -- you
- 10 know -- it'll be wider. It'll leave debris and
- 11 such. So we were walking through old debris to get
- 12 to where the water was running in the creek.
- 13 If you look up at the map again that's
- 14 still on the overhead, I'll direct your attention to this area. Do you recall that that's where the
- 15
- sweat lodge was in 2007? 16
- 17 Α. Yes.
- 18 Q. And just show the jury, then -- just
- 19 illustrate on this overhead how you got the man to
- 20 the creek.

25

1

3

5

- 21 Α. I believe we came out and went kind of
- 22 like that. Closer to the door, but yeah.
- 23 What did the man -- did you observe what
- the man did when you got to the creek? 24
 - Well, he kind of just stopped. Because
 - we were walking, walking, and, like I said, the
- 2 debris from where a flood would be. And then --
- 3 you know -- he kind of just fell right in and he
- 4 was in the water. And then his friend came up
- 5 right behind, and so then I went back.
- 6 Q. Did you ever observe that man again in
- 7 2007?
- 8 I don't remember. Α.
- 9 Do you recall if you later talked to that Q.
- 10 man?
- 11 MR. KELLY: Your Honor, objection. Lack of
- 12 foundation.
- 13 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 14 If you can answer that, ma'am, you may.
- 15 It called for a yes or no. If you can answer in
- that fashion. If you can't, you need to let the 16
- 17 lawyer know that.
- 18 THE WITNESS: I can't recall at this time.
- 19 BY MS. POLK: Okay. Did you assist --
- 20 this is a yes or no question. Did you assist
- 21 anybody -- any other participants from Mr. Ray's
- 22 sweat lodge ceremony in 2007?
- 23 Α.
- Q. 24 And what -- in what way did you assist
- 25 other participants?

- Wiping a face off, pulling them out of
- 2 the door, trying to get them to wake up, comforting
- them, keeping -- putting a blanket or towel on,
- 4 giving them water.

61

1

5

8

- Q. Are you able to recall how many people
- 6 you assisted in 2007?
- 7 Α. Anyone that needed it. Maybe 20.
 - Q. And you say wiping faces off?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. What were you wiping off of the faces?
- 11 Α. I'm not sure what comes out of -- I mean,
- 12 stuff out of their nose. Like when you're throwing
- 13 up and you're sick, you get stuff out of your nose,
- 14 stuff out of their mouth. A lot of them were
- 15 crying. So wiping their faces from that and --
- 16 yeah.

17

1

- Q. Did you see anybody vomiting?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. And then you testified that you assisted
- 20 by waking people up. Do you have a specific
- 21 recollection of somebody that you had to wake up?
- 22 I don't remember the person that was --
- 23 but I remember someone on the Dream Team and I were
- 24 sitting with a person, and they were -- the Dream
- Team lady was, like, touching points on their arms
 - and hands. And I was wondering -- you know -- why
- they were doing that. And I imagine it was some
- 3 reflexology or something.
- 4 MR. KELLY: Your Honor, objection to the
- 5 speculative.
- 6 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 7 BY MS. POLK: And I don't want you to
- 8 guess about anything. But that person that the
- 9 Dream Team member was touching -- what did you
- 10 observe about the person's eyes? Were they open?
- 11
 - Α.
- 12 Q. And what else did you observe about that
- 13 person?
- 14 Α. They were -- they were nonresponsive.
- 15 Q. How long were you with that person?
- 16 Α. Until they woke up.
- 17 Q. And how long did that take?
- 18 Α. I can't recall exactly. I wondered if
- 19 they were going to wake up. It was longer than
- 20 five minutes.
- 21 Q. Did you assist in cooling people off with
- 22 water?
- 23 Α. In 2007, yes.
- 24 Q. How did you do that?
- 25 A hose. Α.

				
Ī		65		67
l	1	Q. Do you recall, Ms. Mercer this is a	1	for with Mr. Ray for Mr. Ray?
	2	yes or no question. Do you recall by the end of	2	A. In 2007?
	3	Mr. Ray's ceremony in 2007 for the final round, do	3	Q. In later. 2008.
	4	you recall how many people were outside?	4	A. Yes.
	5	A. Almost half.	5	Q. Had you done ceremonies in that interim
	6	Q. And for that final round, do you recall	6	for facilitators other than Mr. Ray?
	7	ıf people went back ın?	7	A. Yes, I did.
	8	A. In 2007 I remember a lot of people would	8	Q. And for those ceremonies
١	9	go in and out, in and out. Like, one girl I	9	MR. KELLY: Your Honor, objection. Relevance,
	10	remember came out almost every round, and she'd get	10	other ceremonies.
	11	some water. She was crawling like a dog. And	11	THE COURT: Overruled.
	12	she'd come out and you know put water in her	12	Q. BY MS. POLK: Do you recall the names of
	13	mouth and she'd gobble it up and go back in. So	13	facilitators
	14	there was a lot of going in and in and out in	14	MR. KELLY: Your Honor, objection. 403,
	15	2007.	15	cumulative.
	16	Q. Did you talk to Gary Palish in 2007 about	16	THE COURT: Sustained.
	17	what you were seeing?	17	Q. BY MS. POLK: For the ceremonies
1	18	A. Yes.	18	performed by individuals other than Mr. Ray, were
	19	Q. And do you recall what you said to Gary?	19	you present?
	20	A. I just remember being alarmed at the	20	MR. KELLY: Your Honor, objection.
	21	condition the people were in. And I can't remember	21	THE COURT: You may answer that one.
	22	exactly what he said.	22	Overruled.
	23	Q. Did Mr. Palish address that concern you	23	You may answer that question.
1	24	had?	24	THE WITNESS: Yes. I was present for other
. ├	25	A. He something like they may feel	25	sweat lodges than James Ray International.
"		66		68
	1	MR. KELLY: Your Honor, objection. Hearsay.	1	Q. BY MS. POLK: And I'm asking you
ļ	2	THE COURT: Sustained.	2	specifically between the first sweat lodge ceremony
	3	Q. BY MS. POLK: I just want you to answer	3	for Mr. Ray that you did and then the second one
	4	that yes or no.	4	for Mr. Ray, did you do other ceremonies not
	5	A. No.	5	facilitated by Mr. Ray?
	6 7	Q. Did Mr. Palish address your concern?	6	A. Yes, I did.
ŀ	8	A. Yes. Q. Okay. Did you do other ceremonies, if	7	Q. And do you recall approximately how many?
	9	, , ,	8	A. Approximately three.
	10	you recall, in 2007 that were not facilitated by Mr. Ray?	9	Q. For those ceremonies not facilitated by
1	11	A. I don't recall specifically, but I	110	Mr. Ray, what were your what was your role?
	12	believe I did.	12	MR. KELLY: Your Honor, objection. Relevance. THE COURT: Overruled.
	13	Q. Do you recall	13	
	14	A. I know that I know that in 2007 I	14	THE WITNESS: After James Ray International, I believe I did one more that I was assistant. And
1	15	thought why would anyone do a sweat lodge.	15	then the next one I was the door keeper.
Т	16	MR. KELLY: Your Honor, objection.	16	Q. BY MS. POLK: And tell the jury what the
Т	17	THE COURT: Sustained.	17	door keeper is.
Т	18	And that response is stricken.	18	A. As far as my understanding of what Angel
Т	19	Q. BY MS. POLK: And I just have you	19	Valley told me, the door keeper stays positioned at
Т	00	- ,	l	

21

22

23

24

25

listen to my question. Did you do any sweat lodge

did you do addition -- did you do another ceremony

And do you recall how many ceremony --

ceremonies after Mr. Ray's ceremony in 2007 by

people other than Mr. Ray?

Yes.

Α.

Q.

21

23

24

25

20 the door throughout the entire lodge to -- several

22 when the pourer asks for the door to be opened or

going on there, so I have to be aware of what's

asks for rocks or asks for anything.

purposes. To hold the energy and to be there for

I'm there to halfway listen to what's

```
going on in the lodge enough to hear James Ray call
for the door to be opened.
```

For those ceremonies that you were at facilitated by individuals other than Mr. Ray between Mr. Ray's 2007 ceremony and 2008 -- so I'm asking about ceremonies facilitated by other individuals -- did you observe anybody vomit? MR. KELLY: Your Honor, objection. It's

cumulative. Form of the question.

1

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Counsel, please approach. And ladies and gentlemen, again, please feel free to stand up. And also, Ms. Mercer, if you wish to stand up, that's fine too.

(Sidebar conference.)

THE COURT: Just so we don't have this repeatedly, some corroboration, I understand, can be appropriate. But what I'd be concerned with is foundation. It's very unclear with how much she's really around -- she assisted in one -- did she see? Did she have any basis?

What I'm going to, basically, allow is some corroboration but not going through all the process that she did have a basis to observe. She wasn't back and forth or something. Whatever.

MS. POLK: Okay.

70

2

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

THE COURT: And then basic corroboration.

Mr. Kelly, I understand if you feel you need to object. You've certainly -- well, if you need to object, you have to do that. I don't expect lengthy questioning in this area at all.

Mr. Kelly.

MR. KELLY: Your Honor, I would renew my objection articulated before this witness's testimony. Secondly, I'd object on basis that it's cumulative to Mr. Mercer's testimony.

Finally, Judge, I would object on the form of the question and ask that the prosecutor be directed to simply ask open-ended questions, what did you observe, versus leading the witness through the observations the state wants the jury to hear.

THE COURT: If that happens, there may well be characterizations outside of what -- instead of going through this basic list of heat-related things, there has been medical testimony. Who knows what she will come up with. That's the issue we're talking about.

Ms. Polk can establish foundation. She's there long enough to have a meaningful observation period, so she might have missed things that happened with other people.

If you get past that -- I would

2 anticipate Ms. Polk would be going through that

3 list, confined list, and that would be it. If it's

4 open, then things may happen, and she's going to be

able to answer. I'm just telling you that right

6 now. Trying to keep the evidence somewhat orderly.

7 MR. KELLY: Judge, I would note that yesterday

8 there was no cross-examination on other nonJRI

9 events. We continued to object to this line of

10 questioning and ask that a continuing objection be

11 on the record so that I do not have to continue to

12 object in front of this jury.

13 THE COURT: I'm not going to allow a continuing objection. I cannot do that. That's 14

15 not tenable. 16 In terms of the nonJRI events, that's

17 what goes to this physical causation issue. One of

18 the issues has been the different types of

19 causation. Mr. Li has referred to it. But it's

20 actually manifested in the suggested instructions

21 to me. But again, that's overruled.

22 I know you're objecting, basically, on 23 relevance ground. If that's the case, you have to 24 make the objections.

25 MR. KELLY: Judge, I would also state for the

record that we have no ability midway through trial

to present a witness to contest this particular witness's testimony as proffered by the State of 3

Arizona. It affects our right of confrontation.

5 As an example, I would point to the JRI 6 events in 2008 where the photographs clearly show

that, although some people appeared to be in some

8

sort of distress, other people are very, very

9 happy. And we have no ability to confront this

type of evidence because we didn't know that nonJRI

11 events were going to be admissible in the state's

12 case in chief.

> THE COURT: Ms. Polk, what about that? I can't remember -- well, is that in the transcripts you've provided to me or are providing argument on that particular point?

MR. KELLY: Judge, I don't want to misstate what's in a transcript or in argument. But we have always believed, given the Court's representations and the disclosure statements provided, that there is not going to be reference to nonJRI events.

22 And I direct your attention to 23 Ms. Foster's testimony in the sidebar where we had

24 this discussion. It was somewhat reaffirmed by

Your Honor's statements last Friday. So, again,

72

1 the problem is one basic confrontation.

2 THE COURT: I want you to --

3 MS. POLK: First of all, they can confront

this witness. Secondly, the Court's ruling on the 4

404(b) was not until February 3, 2011. The witness

6 list for both the state and the defense were due

7 before then and submitted before that court ruling.

So the suggestion that they cannot bring in other

9 witnesses simply is not supported by the facts in

the case. 10

11

18

19

20

21

1

February 3 was the Court's ruling.

12 February 14 the state filed a motion for

reconsideration. And on March 1 the Court 13

14 indicated clearly that the information was relevant

to the issue of causation and has continued to 15

emphasize that throughout the -- we're kind of 16

17 rehashing an issue we've gone over and over.

their case with one thing in mind isn't born out by

But the suggestion that they prepared

the fact that witness lists and exhibit lists were

due before the Court's ruling on February 3.

22 But they can confront this witness. And

23 they can bring in other witnesses from each one of

these years. All that information was disclosed to 24

the defense in over about 8,000 pages of disclosure 25

74

now. I'm not quite sure what the issue is.

2 MR. KELLY: I believe the Sixth Amendment is a

3 little more broad than simple cross-examination.

It's a right to confront the accuracy or

5 credibility of a witness by innumerable grounds,

6 including extrinsic evidence.

7 We have other participants' names. They

8 were never disclosed in the nonJRI events that this

9 lady attended. We don't know if she was there. We

10 have to take her answer simply based on what it is

11 today in front of the jury. That's the

12 confrontation issue, Judge.

13 We do have a copy of the April 1 --

14 portion of the transcript from April 1. And this

issue was addressed with Fawn Foster. It was my 15

16 understanding during that discussion that we

17 weren't going to go into nonJRI events and make

18 comparisons.

> THE COURT: There was -- again, we're talking about materials used and issues that go to weight

20 21 and foundation and all those various things and

22 what was -- about Ms. Foster was going to have her

23 get into. To me the recollection was expert

24 somehow. And that's what I recall about that.

Anyway, Ms. Polk and Mr. Kelly, I've 25

indicated how it goes through. Ms. Polk will ask a

question. I'm going to allow some leading in this

area. If it's sustained, Ms. Polk is going to have

4 to ask what the observations are and the answer is

going to be what it is.

6 MS. POLK: Your Honor, I didn't understand why

7 you sustained on who the facilitators were for

non -- for other events. I was just trying to lay

9 foundation.

11

15

10 THE COURT: Well, go ahead, Mr. Kelly.

MR. KELLY: My thought that the title

12 itself is, first of all, cumulative. Submit all of

13 this is cumulative given Mr. Mercer's testimony

yesterday. It has minimal probative value. 14

And the names provided by Mr. Mercer,

16 based on my experience in Arizona, are names

17 typically of Native Americans. And it implies

improperly that if you're not a Native American,

19 you cannot do this.

20 THE COURT: That's what went through my mind

21 at the time, emphasizing an aspect. These

22 witnesses -- I'm not going to release because I'm

23 looking at the cumulative effect. I've talked

24 about it. If the defense for some reason goes into

that, there may be reasons to have rebuttal, so

1 these people are staying on.

2 Yes. We don't need to be mentioning

names. We're down to where there can be some

corroboration. It doesn't need to be much. If the

defense really challenges that sometimes, and there

might be some balancing that has to be considered

on rebuttal. This should be very, very quickly. I

8 hope we have the ground rules at this point.

Thank you.

9

17

18

23

10 (End of sidebar conference.)

11 THE COURT: Ms. Polk.

12 MS. POLK: Thank you.

13 Q. Thank you, Ms. Mercer. In 2007 for the

14 sweat lodges that you attended not conducted by

Mr. Ray, were you at the sweat lodge site for the

16 entire ceremony?

A. Most of them I was.

Q. And which ones were you not?

19 A. Well, I would just say that during the --20 I smoke cigarettes. So at one point I might have 21 gone off to the side and smoked a cigarette. But

Q. And when you went off to the side to

22 other than that I would have been there.

24 smoke a cigarette, did you leave the area of the

sweat lodge?

Page 77 to 80 of 210

20 of 53 sheets

2

3

5

8

- 1 and 247. Do you recognize all these photographs?
- 2 A. Yes, I do.
- 3 Q. Are these the photographs that you took?
- 4 A. Yes
- **Q.** In 2009 did you provide these photographs
- 6 to Detective Diskin?
- 7 A. Yes, I did.
 - Q. And do you see Detective Diskin here in
- 9 the court?
- 10 A. Yes, I do.
- 11 Q. Did you know Detective Diskin before
- 12 2009?

8

- 13 A. No.
- 14 Q. Where were the photographs when you
- 15 retrieved them and gave them to Detective Diskin?
- 16 A. On my computer.
- 17 Q. Did you help build this frame?
- 18 A. Yes, I did.
- 19 Q. I just want to put up on the overhead
- 20 Exhibit 242, for example.
- 21 Can you tell the jury what's happening
- 22 here.
- A. Well, the sticks are being tied to create
- 24 the dome structure.
- 25 Q. Did you know how to build a frame for a
- 82

- 1 sweat lodge?
- 2 A. No.
- 3 Q. And do you recall how many days it took
- 4 you?
- 5 A. No. It took us longer than we thought
- 6 because -- I'd say four days.
- 7 Q. And who showed you how to build a sweat
- 8 lodge frame?
- 9 A. Well, the gentleman here. And somebody
- 10 else came. I just -- I just did what Ted told me
- 11 to do. I don't -- nobody else told me what to do
- 12 actually.
- 13 Q. I'm going to put up on the overhead
- 14 Exhibit 245. Is that you?
- 15 A. Me and my dog. Yes, it is.
- **Q.** Do you know who took this picture?
- 17 A. No. Either Anita or Ted.
- 18 Q. And then 246. Do you recognize that as
- 19 the frame of the sweat lodge you constructed
- 20 in 2008?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. Did you participate in putting the
- 23 coverings on the sweat lodge, on the frame?
- 24 A. Yes, I did.
- **Q.** And did you participate in getting the

- 1 coverings from a location at Angel Valley?
 - A. Yes, I did.
 - Q. Who did you help do that?
- 4 A. What year?
 - Q. Well, we're talking about 2008 when you
- 6 constructed this particular frame and sweat -- and
- 7 sweat lodge.
 - A. That year it was Ted, Anita, and I.
- **Q.** And did you actually go somewhere and get
- 10 the blankets and the sleeping bags and the tarps?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Where did you go to get them?
- 13 A. The blankets, sleeping bags, and tarps
- 14 were stored in the pump house on the property.
- **Q.** Did you personally retrieve the coverings
- 16 for the sweat lodge on more than one occasion?
 - A. Yes. But I needed help. I didn't do it
- 18 myself.

17

21

24

5

- 19 Q. Who would you help or who would help you?
- 20 A. Either Ted or Anita.
 - Q. How many times, Ms. Mercer, between 2007
- 22 and 2009 did you go to the pump house and get the
- 23 coverings for the sweat lodge?
 - A. In a number? As many times as there was
- 25 a sweat lodge, so I'd say 8 to 10. But we have to
- 2
- 1 put them back too.
- **Q.** That was going to be my next question.
- 3 When a sweat lodge was finished, did you
- 4 participate in dismantling it?
 - A. Yes, I did.
- **Q.** And tell the jury what that entailed.
- 7 A. We would -- that night -- or the day of
- 8 the sweat lodge you left it. The next day we would
- 9 take the tarps off and the blankets and fold them
- 5 take the tarps on and the plankets and rold then
- 10 up.

- Can I elaborate?
- 12 Q. Yes.
- 13 A. For most sweat lodges we'd take the tarps
- 14 off and the blankets and put them all away in one
- 15 day. James Ray International sweat lodges, the
- 16 blankets were very wet afterwards, so we would take
- 17 the tarps off and leave the blankets on top of the
- 18 dome for another day to air out and dry before we
- 19 took them off and folded them up and put them away.
- **Q.** And did you always put all of the
- 21 blankets and the tarps back in the same pump house?
- A. Yes. They all were -- were stored in the same place.
- **Q.** Between 2007 and 2009, when you retrieved
- 25 the blankets for the sweat lodge, did you ever

1

2

8

19

22

1

2

- 1 notice any sort of chemical or a rat poison in
- 2 those blankets?
- 3 A. No.
- Q. And the same question -- well, let me ask
- you. Where were the blankets specifically stored
- 6 in the pump house?
- 7 A. The blankets were on a table.
 - Q. And where were the tarps?
- 9 A. That big brown one was on the left side
- 10 of the door, and the other ones were usually on the
- 11 right.

8

- 12 Q. And did you personally participate in
- 13 helping to retrieve the tarps that were on the
- 14 right?
- 15 A. Yes. Although I tried to avoid that
- 16 brown one because it's heavy.
- 17 Q. At any time between 2007 and 2009, when
- 18 you retrieved the tarps, did you ever observe any
- 19 sort of product that appeared to be a rat poison
- 20 fall out of the tarps?
- 21 A. No, I did not.
- 22 Q. And the same question for the brown
- 23 thing. At any time between 2007 and 2009, when you
- 24 were getting near the brown cover, did you ever
- 25 observe any product that appeared to be rat poison

fall out of it?

1

- 2 A. No, I did not.
- 3 Q. The sweat lodge that we see in the
- 4 picture that's on the overhead now, which is
- 5 Exhibit 246 -- is this the sweat lodge that Mr. Ray
- 6 performed his ceremony in 2008 in?
- 7 A. Yes.
 - Q. Did you have a role in that ceremony?
- 9 A. Yes, I did.
- 10 Q. Tell the jury what your role was.
- 11 A. In 2008 I was assistant fire -- assistant
- 12 door keeper.
- 13 Q. What did the assistant door keeper do?
- 14 A. The same thing the door keeper did. I
- 15 was just there with him. I hadn't done a James
- 16 Ray -- I hadn't been the door keeper for a James
- 17 Ray International event. And so Gary was there,
- the Ray International event. And so daily was there
- 18 and I was just assisting.
- 19 Q. Was Gary training you?
- 20 A. I wouldn't say he said I'm going to train
- 21 you for this, but I was definitely -- you know --
- 22 watching. But I had done three or four by then. I
- 23 just hadn't done one for Mr. Ray.
- **Q.** You had done three or four as a door
- 25 keeper before?

- A. Uh-huh.
- Q. And I'd like you to talk about Mr. Ray's
- 3 ceremony, then, in 2008. And I want you
- 4 specifically to limit your testimony to what you
- 5 personally saw or heard.
- **6** Was your attention drawn to a specific
- 7 individual? Yes or no?
 - A. Yes.
- 9 Q. And do you recall at what point in the
- 10 ceremony your attention was drawn to a specific
- 11 individual?
- 12 A. It's hard to think.
- 13 Q. Let me ask you this, Ms. Mercer: Was
- 14 your attention drawn to a specific individual
- 15 before the ceremony was over?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. And what about that individual drew your
 - 8 attention? Limiting it to what you observed.
 - A. There were several.
- 20 Q. And we'll talk about several. But I just
- 21 want to talk about one at a time.
 - A. Okay.
- **Q.** So just think of one person whose
- 24 attention -- who attracted your attention.
- 25 A. Okay.
- 86
- **Q**. And --
- A. Probably about the fifth or sixth round,
- 3 my attention was drawn to a fellow who had
- 4 previously come out of the sweat lodge not alert.
- 5 He was passed out.
- **Q.** And how did you -- when did you first see
- 7 somebody that you're now say -- that you're saying
- 8 is passed out?
- 9 A. Well, I know I had helped drag him out.
- 10 And then a few minutes later he was up and running
- 11 around yelling. His girlfriend or wife was in
- 12 there and -- still in the sweat lodge. And he was
- 13 concerned for her and wanted to get her out and was
- 14 trying to get into the sweat lodge to get her out.
- MR. KELLY: Your Honor, I'm going to object.
- 16 Speculative as to the intent of this person.
- 17 THE WITNESS: Can I expand?
- 18 THE COURT: The objection is sustained.
- 19 Q. BY MS. POLK: Did you approach that man?
- 20 Yes or no?
- 21 A. Yes.
- **Q.** And what did you do? Without speculating
- 23 about what he was -- his intentions were, what did
- 24 you do?
- 25 A. Talked to him and talk -- tried to calm

Page 89 to 92 of 210

Q.

How long were you with her in the

25

23 of 53 sheets

Did you see what happened to her? Was

			93		-		95
	1	bathroom?		1	appropria	tely responsive?	
	2	Α.	A. Once she got in the bathtub, I left.		A.	No.	
	3	Q.	How did she get into the bathtub?	3	Q.	Did you leave him?	
	4	A.	The same guy who carried her in onto	4	Α.	Yes.	
	5	the golf o	the golf cart, I believe, put her in the bathtub.		Q.	And how come?	
	6	Q. Did you observe her at all while she was			Α.	A Dream Team member came up.	
	7	in the bathtub?			Q.	And did you see that man again later?	
	8	Α.	No. I left. I it kind of bothers me	8	A.	Yes.	
	9	to see pe	ople like that. So I the guy said he	9	Q.	Did you talk to him then?	
1	10	was a do	ctor, so I I left.	10	Α.	Yes.	
1	11	Q.	Did you see that lady later again?	11	Q.	And what did you talk about then?	
1	12	Α.	I don't know. Not that I recall.	12	A.	I asked him if how he was. And he	
1	13	Q.	Was your attention drawn to another	13	didn't		
1	14	person at	any tıme durıng or after Mr. Ray's sweat	14	MR.	KELLY: Your Honor, objection. Hearsay.	
1	15	lodge cere	mony in 2008?	15	MS.	POLK: It's not offered for the truth,	
1	16	Α.	I remember an oriental guy who	16	Your Hone	or.	
1	17	Oh. Am I supposed to continue.		17	MR.	KELLY: And relevance.	
1	18	Q.	Yes. Was your attention drawn to another	18	THE	COURT: Are you asking for statement of	
1	19	person? Yes or no? A. Yes. Q. And what about that person drew your attention? A. He didn't know where he was or who he was		19	his physic	cal condition? What are you what's the	
2	20			20	question	geared to?	
2	21			21	MS.	POLK: Yes. How well, what he	
2	22			22	remembe	rs.	
2	23			23	THE	COURT: Sustained.	
2	24	or		24	Q.	BY MS. POLK: How long did you have	
2	25	MR.	KELLY: Your Honor, objection.	25	contact w	ith that man later?	
			94				96
	1	THE	COURT: Sustained as to foundation.	1	Α.	Five minutes.	
	2	Q.	BY MS. POLK: Let me ask you first, when	2	Q.	And where were you when you later had	
Î	3	was it that your attention was drawn to this		3	contact w	ith him?	
	4	person?		4	A.	The dining hall.	
	5	Α.	After the sweat lodge.	5	Q.	Was your attention drawn to another	
	6	Q.	And did you have contact with this	6	ındivıdual	at any time during or after	
	7	person?		7	Mr. Ray's	2008 sweat lodge ceremony?	
	8	A.	Yes, I did.	8	Α.	Yes.	
	9	Q.	Why did you have why did you did	9	Q.	And are you thinking of a specific	
- 1	0	you approa	ach the person?	10	ındıvıdual	?	
- 1	1	A.	Yes.	11	Α.	It's hard to think of specifics.	
	2	Q.	And without telling me what that person	12	Q.	Let me ask you this: Did you render	
	3	was thinking, what did you personally see that made		13	assistance	e to individuals other than those you've	
1	4	you approach him?		14	already testified about?		
-	5	Α.	He looked like he needed help.	15	Α.	Probably yes.	
	6	Q.	Did you render him assistance?	16	Q.	And are you able to recall today this	
	7	Α.	I started talking to him.	17	-	r no question. Are you able to recall	
1	8	Q.	Did he did he respond to you?	18		many people you rendered assistance to?	
- [9	Α.	Yes. But not logically.	19	Α.	At least a dozen.	
- 1	20	Q.	Okay. How long were you with him?	20	Q.	What sort of assistance did you render to	
71	21	Α.	Ten minutes.	21	those 12 p		
1	2		Q. What did you do for him? A. I talked to him. I got him water and a		Α.	Getting them something to drink or	
	23				_	vanted fruit. Getting something to drin	
⊣ 2	4 towel.		24		cooling them off or laying them down o	r	
-) E						
- {	!5	Q.	During that ten minutes, did he become Page 93 t	25		em up or talking to them or getting a	f 53 sheets

- 1 Dream Team person over.
- Q. This is a yes or no question. Did youpersonally observe anybody vomiting?
- A. Yes, I did.
- Q. And did you observe -- personally observeother signs of physical distress in participants?
- 7 A. Yes, I did.
 - Q. Tell the jury what.
- 9 A. People -- I don't know if that's
- 10 distress. But they had obviously no control of
- 11 their bodily functions. People were crying; people
- were throwing up, passed out; stuff coming out oftheir face and mouth and crying; not being able to
- 14 walk, just laying in a ball curled up in a fetal
- 15 position.

8

- **Q.** Did you see that in 2008?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. And what do you specifically recall? Do
- 19 you recall a person curled up?
- 20 A. Yeah.
 - **Q.** When was your attention drawn to that
- 22 person?

21

24

7

- 23 A. After the sweat lodge.
 - Q. Did you go to that person?
- 25 A. I don't know if I did help that person
 - that I'm -- that I'm thinking of. There were
- 2 several people -- you saw the pictures. I don't
- 3 know how to --
- 4 Q. And you just mentioned pictures. Did you
- 5 take pictures in 2008 after Mr. Ray's sweat lodge
- 6 ceremony?
 - A. I took some pictures. Yes.
- **Q.** When did you take pictures?
- 9 A. It would have been after all of my duties
- 10 as the assistant door keeper were done.
- 11 Q. Do you recall how much time, between the
- 12 end of Mr. Ray's ceremony before you started taking
- 13 pictures, how much time had passed?
- 14 A. Approximately 25, 30 minutes.
- **Q.** Do you recall -- why did you take
- 16 pictures?
- 17 A. Because my friend Anita, the other girl
- 18 in the -- she's from Switzerland. And she wanted
- 19 to see what the crazy Americans were doing.
- THE COURT: Ms. Polk, we need to take a recess this morning. So let's do that at this time.
- 22 Thank you.
- 23 And, ladies and gentlemen, we'll take the
- 24 morning recess. We got a late start. Please be
- 25 reassembled and ready to begin at 25 after. And

- 1 then we'll get some time in before noon. Remember
- 2 the admonition.
- 3 And I want to talk to Ms. Mercer. The
- 4 rule of exclusion of witnesses has been invoked,
- which means you cannot talk about the testimony
- 6 that you're giving or the case at all, communicate
- 7 in any way about those things with any other
- 8 witness until the trial is completely over.
 - THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
- 10 THE COURT: And you can't try to do that in
- 11 any fashion to a third person. And I know because
- 12 family relationships, it's particularly important
- 13 that you -- you follow this rule. It's always
- 14 important for all witnesses to do that. But you
- 15 just cannot communicate with other witnesses in any
- 16 way about the case or your testimony.
- 17 However, you can talk to the lawyers if
- 18 no other witness is present.
- **19** Do you understand that?
- 20 THE WITNESS: I understand.
- 21 THE COURT: Okay. Then you are excused at
- 22 this time.

98

- 23 And we are in recess. Thank you.
- 24 (Recess.)
- 25 THE COURT: The record will show the presence

100

- 1 of the defendant, Mr. Ray; the attorneys, the jury.
- 2 Ms. Mercer is back on the witness stand, and she's
- 3 under oath.
- 4 Ms. Polk, you may continue.
 - MS. POLK: Thank you, Your Honor.
- **Q.** Ms. Mercer, I'm going to show you
- 7 Exhibits 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, and 847 and
- 8 848, and ask you just to take a moment and look at
- 9 them.

5

11

17

- 10 Do you recognize those pictures?
 - A. Yes, I do.
- **Q.** And are these the pictures that you took?
- 13 A. Yes, they are.
- 14 Q. Tell the jury about how much time after
- 15 Mr. Ray ended his ceremony was it that you took
- 16 these pictures.
 - A. It was probably 25 to 30 minutes later.
- 18 Q. And you testified about a lady in a fetal
- 19 position. Do you see that lady in any of these
- 20 pictures?
- 21 A. Yes.
- **Q.** Can you show me where.
- 23 A. Right here.
 - Q. Do you see her in any of the other
- 25 pictures?

24

25

saw or heard, not your guess as to what was going

on. Don't guess about what was causing it but just

what you observed in terms of physical

23

24

25

Q.

Α.

that?

And how did you get to personally observe

I was directly at the door.

lady looked like?

Q. BY MS. POLK: Do you recall what that

24

25

24

25

vomit?

MR. KELLY: Your Honor, objection. Sixth

- 1 Judge. The question is, what did you observe. The
- 2 answer is, they looked fine. Not their state of
- mind. Not some hearsay response. And I take issue
- 4 with the Court and counsel when she is allowed to
- lead them through some predetermined set of
- 6 physical characteristics she wants to bolster
- 7 hearsay.
- 8 THE COURT: Mr. Li requested that, Mr. Kelly.
- **9** MR. KELLY: It's damaging to my client. The
- 10 simple response, what did you observe.
- 11 THE COURT: Are you saying Mr. Li did not say
- 12 that yesterday?
- 13 MR. KELLY: Judge, I don't recall. I can't
- 14 address that.
- 15 THE COURT: I'm trying to get through,
- 16 Mr. Kelly, an area quickly. And it's being
- 17 rendered so much more difficult.
- 18 MS. POLK: Let me ask -- can I ask how did
- 19 they look?
- 20 MR. KELLY: Same as what did you observe.
- 21 When she starts talking about expressed gratitude,
- 22 that's not -- that's not even relevance offered for
- 23 the truth.
- 24 THE COURT: If you look closely at 803(3) -- I
- 25 don't want to interject. We're not talking about
- 1 that. The point was causation and physical effects
- 2 and her observations with regard to that, so
- 3 observations with regard to physical effects.
- 4 MR. KELLY: She said they look fine. Okay.
- 5 Fine with me. I don't have a problem.
- 6 MS. POLK: I'll ask how they looked and ask
- 7 did she render assistance to anybody.
- 8 MR. KELLY: Objection. Relevance. If they
- 9 look fine, you don't need to -- why would you
- 10 emphasize it.
- 11 THE COURT: The other thing, rendering
- 12 assistance. It comes out she hands people a drink
- 13 of water, we just go through that. That's
- 14 cumulative.
- **15** (End of sidebar.)
- 16 THE COURT: Ms. Polk.
- 17 MS. POLK: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 18 Q. Ms. Mercer, with respect to those
- 19 participants who had participated in a ceremony in
- 20 Angel Valley in 2008 not facilitated by Mr. Ray,
- 21 how did they look after the ceremony? How did they
- 22 look?
- 23 A. Like they did when they went in.
- 24 Healthy, happy.
- 25 Q. Okay. Thank you. Between December -- in

- 1 September of 2008 when Mr. Ray performed his
- 2 ceremony at Angel Valley, were you living at Angel
- 3 Valley?

8

17

18

24

114

- 4 A. Yes.
 - Q. And did there come a time that you moved
- 6 out of the Angel Valley area?
- 7 A. Yes.
 - Q. When was that?
- 9 A. We moved off of the property in November
- 10 of 2009.
- 11 Q. Did there come a time when you no longer
- 12 worked for the Hamiltons at Angel Valley?
- 13 A. I never worked for Angel Valley as an
- 14 employee. I was a volunteer. But as of -- no. I
- 15 think it was December 2008 I was told my services
- 16 were no longer needed.
 - **Q.** And the same for your husband?
 - A. Yes
- 19 Q. After that did you continue to live on
- 20 the Angel Valley property? I should -- I didn't
- 21 ask that well.
- 22 Did you continue to learn in -- live in
- 23 Angel Valley?
 - A. I lived in the area. There are two
- 25 private houses that have nothing to do with Angel
 - 116
- 1 Valley that are on that property.
- 2 Q. And you and your you husband continued to
- 3 live there?
- 4 A. Yes. We rented a house from the
- gentleman who owned one of them. He inherited it.
- 6 He doesn't live there.
- 7 Q. Did you assist with additional sweat
- 8 lodge ceremonies in 2009?
- 9 A. Yes, I did.
- 10 Q. How many?
- 11 A. One.
- 12 Q. Which one?
- 13 A. It was for a woman named Healing Wolf.
- **14 Q.** And do you recall when that was?
 - A. In May was the beginning of the year.
- Q. Did you do a second sweat lodge ceremony
- **17** in 2009?

- 18 A. Yes, I did.
- 19 Q. And whose was that?
- 20 A. James Ray International.
- 21 Q. Let's talk about the ceremony in 2009
- 22 facilitated by Mr. Ray. First of all, do you
- 23 recall ---
- MR. KELLY: Excuse me, Ms. Polk.
- 25 Judge, at this point in time I request a

117 119 105 limiting instruction be provided to the jury. before she begins the October '09 ceremony, THE COURT: What we'll do is go ahead and take whatever time in the direct that happens. the afternoon recess at this time. 3 THE COURT: Okay. All right. That seems Ladies and gentlemen, please remember the 4 logical. admonition, of course, and be reassembled at 1:30. 5 Ms. Polk? I think Ms. Rybar mentioned to you that it is 6 MS. POLK: I agree. 7 necessary to recess by 4:00. I think she told me THE COURT: Okay. that she mentioned that to you. 8 And, Mr. Li, what did you --9 And, Ms. Mercer, you will be excused too, MR. LI: I don't have anything more to add but remember the rule of exclusion I discussed. 10 than what I said this morning. You have to follow that. 11 THE COURT: I thought Mr. Kelly indicated. Okay? 12 Mr. Hughes, the instruction that you THE WITNESS: Yes. 13 drafted, as I've indicated with just -- and this is THE COURT: All right. So you are excused and what really concerns me about it. It would permit 14 the jury is excused. 15 the jury to make use of evidence where, for the I'm going to ask the parties to remain a 16 specific purpose that we've been discussing and how moment. 17 it's been presented to me, would not be

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

(Proceedings continued outside presence

of jury.)

THE COURT: The record will show the presence 20 21 of Mr. Ray and the attorneys. The witness has 22 left. The jury has left.

23 And I've been looking over the proposed instructions. Mr. Kelly, you're -- I wanted to do 24

25 this rather than have a --

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

1

2

3

4

5

118

120

MR. KELLY: Yes. And thank you, Judge. And if we're going to address the timing, if there's any objection, I'll address that. But Mr. Li is addressing the substance of the --THE COURT: With regard to the timing, I agreed -- I think the parties agree it needs to be

6 7 today. 8 MR. KELLY: My point would be, Judge, I

9 believe in listening to the direct examination, 10 other sweat lodge events have been covered. Now 11 we're moving into the JRI 2009. So I believe that

12 this is the appropriate time.

13 THE COURT: Let me ask Ms. Polk.

14 Is that your intention, then, to move on? I see your question has to do with the 2009 15 16 ceremony now.

MS. POLK: Your Honor, I do need to cover 17 the 2009 May ceremony, which is another event, and 19 then I'll move into Mr. Ray's.

20 THE COURT: Mr. Kelly? 21 MR. KELLY: To the extent the -- I was 22 listening carefully, and I preserve my right to 23 object as to whether or not that's cumulative. But 24 if we're going to back up, go through May of '09,

then I would request that this instruction be read

needs to be done rather than just a very -- a bare statement, essentially. You can't consider this as

appropriate. It just doesn't -- it doesn't cover

that it's only considered for that -- that limited

don't know that either side can really help me.

those things that would be required to make sure

purpose. The defense instruction is much closer.

But with what I've got now, defense instruction is

certainly much closer to giving the guidance that

I have my concerns with that. And I

character evidence. It also has to do with what

they can consider it for.

5 And you don't really -- other than -- you know -- cause of -- it gets into that mixed notion 6 of cause, some kind of physical causation versus 8 something that relates much more to -- to mental 9 state.

10 So I'm going to have to look at this and 11 come up with something over lunch.

12 Thank you. Be in recess.

13 (Recess.)

14 THE COURT: The record will show the presence of Mr. Ray and the attorneys, not the jury.

16 I did draft, a proposed special

17 instruction.

18 Mr. Li.

19 MR. LI: I'm sorry. Was the Court asking me 20 to address?

21 THE COURT: Yeah. I know you've all read this 22 now. So --

MR. LI: I didn't want to be presumptuous,

24 Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. LI: Well, there's two points that I'd like to make about this instruction. The first is that the Court made a ruling in February that was very specific about the purposes to which evidence could be used and could not be used.

2

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

One of the specific findings that the Court made in February was that the evidence that we've heard, again, was not sufficient to put anybody on notice of a life-threatening condition.

And I think because the Court has made that ruling, even by a lower standard, which is a clear and convincing standard, the Court -- the instruction should actually instruct the jury. So -- because that's exactly the ruling that the Court made.

The second point that I think is very important is in the last sentence -- that you may only consider -- you know -- the evidence. I would urge the Court to adopt the sentence that we had used, which is that you may only consider the evidence from those prior sweat lodge ceremonies, 22 If believed, as it may relate to whether the state has proven beyond a reasonable double that the decedent died of heat stroke and not a different cause.

122

23

24

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

24

25

And the reason is because this -- one. that's an accurate statement of the law. And when we instruct the jury, I mean, there's no reason not to state that that's actually what the rules are. The second point is the jury needs to

5 understand this isn't just sort of a 50/50 6 7 balancing test. The defense has actually no burden. And we cannot have the jury sitting here 8 9 listening to all this evidence and with -- you know -- questions about whether Ms. Do has shown 10 11 any evidence to various people. They cannot be 12 left with the impression that the defense has some burden to prove a cause of death other than heat 13 14 stroke.

It is, in fact, the state's burden to prove the cause of death was heat stroke beyond a 16 reasonable doubt. And I think it needs to say that, because right now they may be under the misimpression that it's just sort of a -- you know -- one side has -- the defense has to prove something and the state has to prove something, and then when you -- you know -- when you evaluate this evidence, you can figure out which one you think is more likely. And that's not -- that's not the law. And I think we should instruct the jurors as to

1 exactly what the law is.

2 I'm not suggesting, Your Honor, that this language in the Court's instruction -- I just want 4 to be clear. I'm not suggesting that the language in the Court's instruction says, hey. You can 6 balance this any way you want.

7 I just think that the state -- or the 8 state's burden has to be articulated to the jurors 9 so that they understand that when they're hearing 10 all this evidence of people throwing up and the 11 like, that they're not supposed to just sit there 12 and guess, well, that seems like it might be like 13 heat stroke, and it's a 50/50. We'll figure out that -- you know -- we'll see what the defense can 15 prove. I think we have to articulate what the 16 burden actually is. 17

And just to go back to the first point 18 about knowledge, one of the concerns here is that 19 as we hear all this evidence coming in about these 20 prior acts -- you know -- there is a question 21 raised as to what -- you know -- I'm sure in the 22 minds of the jurors as to what Mr. Ray's state of knowledge is.

I think we need to be absolutely clear that not only can they not consider any of this

for Mr. Ray's knowledge but that the Court has explicitly found that this exact evidence does not

3 provide notice.

4 And I'm -- you know -- our original instruction was drafted directly from the Court's 6 order. It's not sufficiently similar to the medical conditions associated with the deaths in 2009 to put a person on notice of substantial 9 risk in 2009. We drafted it directly from the 10 Court's order. If that's the order, if that's the 11 only purpose that this particular evidence can be 12 used, it should say so.

And that's our request, Your Honor, is that we -- we put back in that sentence about -you know -- that not sufficiently similar to the medical conditions associated in 2009 to put a person on substantial -- risk of substantial -sorry -- notice of substantial risk of death in 2009.

And that the last sentence also be 21 modified to indicate that the state has a burden to 22 prove beyond a reasonable doubt, which they do, the causation of this death -- these deaths and that those -- the causation is heat stroke. That's their burden. And this instruction should say so.

31 of 53 sheets

1 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Li. 2

MR. LI: Thank you, Your Honor.

3 THE COURT: Mr. Hughes.

4

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

3

4

8

9

18

19

20

21

22

MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, the state has reviewed the Court's proposed limiting instruction and -- with one, I think, minor exception, we believe it's -- it's appropriate and do not object to it being given.

With respect to the defendant's argument that there should be this preamble that's contained within the defendant's proposed instructions, again, the preamble is not appropriate for the reasons the state expressed earlier today.

105 provides for a limiting instruction 15 to limit its proper scope. It doesn't talk about a preamble. And, again, such a preamble would be confusing because it's referring to an evidentiary hearing that occurred prior to the jury hearing the evidence, refers to different testimony than the jury has heard.

With respect to the Court's proposed instruction, the only change the state would ask is in the very final sentence, which says to whether the physical cause of death of the decedents was 25 heat stroke or some other physical cause.

126

A concern -- and it hasn't come vet, but I'll tell the Court where it's going. Dr. Mosley has a semantical difference of opinion from Dr. Lyon.

5 THE COURT: That's come up. And here's why I 6 put the language the way it is. It's also really 7 in response to what Mr. Li is bringing up.

The other is multiorgan failure or something due to -- and so the state isn't --

10 Is that the semantical difference you're 11 talking about?

12 MR. HUGHES: That's one of two, Your Honor. 13 The semantical difference is Dr. Mosley. And I'm 14 referring to Exhibit 362, which is the autopsy 15 report, indicated Ms. Neuman died as a result of 16 multisystem organ failure due to hyperthermia, due 17 to prolonged sweat lodge exposure.

I think if instead of saying -- and then the other issue is Dr. Lyon had -- in addition to the cause of death of heat stroke for Mr. Shore, he also indicated a cause of death of -- of the heart condition.

23 Your Honor, I think it would be better 24 to -- and more accurate to limit that final

sentence. Instead of saying cause of death was

heat stroke, it could say cause of death was

related to heat exposure or some other physical

3 cause.

11

4 I think that would address the semantical 5 difference between the two medical examiners and

6 would also address the possibility, as Dr. Lyon

7 testified, that the exposure to the heat may have

aggravated or sped up the heart condition that

Mr. Shore was one -- that was one of the causes of

10 death of Mr. Shore.

MR. LI: Your Honor, may I respond?

12 THE COURT: Yes. Please focus.

13 MR. LI: Okay. It will be brief. With

respect to the cause of death, No. 1, Dr. Lyon did

15 not testify that Mr. Shore died of heart-related

thing. He simply said it was possible but he

17 didn't know.

18 Secondly, I think it's fairly easy for 19 Dr. Mosley to say it's simply semantics difference, 20 which he has said --

21 THE COURT: I know. I did not -- I knew that 22 was the state's argument. I'm not saying it's

semantic. I'm not saying that. But I just wanted

24 to let Mr. Hughes know. I know the general issue

that can come up and that if it just said heat

stroke or one other thing, the state's not saying 2 it's necessarily heat stroke.

3 In your view, it could be something -- In your view, it's heat stroke or it's -- and it's a

semantical difference or it's not a semantical

difference. And there's it is. And here's what 6

7 I --

8

Go ahead, Mr. Li. I interrupted you.

9 What else did you want to say?

10 MR. LI: Well, I think it's critical that the 11 state be put to its burden and that the jury be

12 alerted to the fact that it's still the state's

13 burden to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the

14 decedents died of heat stroke. I don't think we

can say heat exposure because that -- that is

16 really lowering the bar.

17 THE COURT: Mr. Li, again, just to try to get 18 right to the point on this.

MR. LI: Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Hughes, I was concerned about when you put these other things down there, they're going to be equated. And they're not equated. In

23 the 404(b) they were not equated. With Dr. Lyon

24 they were not equated. There's some testimony

about a spectrum or a continuum. That's why

32 of 53 sheets

19

20

21

there's evidence to this effect.

2

6

7

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

The language you're suggesting would -would destroy that mark when you -- when you really cross over into the life-threatening condition of heat stroke. So I was concerned about that suggestion.

MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, I think Dr. Mosley is going to explain that -- that hyperthermia is also a life-threatening condition that is fatal. Again, it's a semantical difference.

The defense is suggesting that we now 12 have the burden of proving that it was heat stroke and perhaps not hyperthermia that caused the death. It's the state's burden to show Mr. Ray caused the deaths. And that's what the evidence, in the state's opinion, has lead to at this point.

However, to say that we have a burden of proving that he caused the deaths by heat stroke and no other way is to limit the state's case and it's to limit, improperly limit, the scope of the evidence so far. And that likely is to come in 22 from Dr. Mosley and from the state's medical expert. That's where I'm coming from.

24 "Heat stroke" is the term that Dr. Lyon 25 chose to use. Dr. Mosley is going to, I believe,

130

choose to use the term "hyperthermia" along with 2 that other verbiage I read from the exhibit.

3 The jury instruction appears to limit it to heat stroke, which is not what the evidence will 5 be when Dr. Mosley --

6 THE COURT: No. It does not. It says heat 7 stroke or some other physical cause. So there's no 8

limitation there. It could be another physical

9 cause that the state is suggesting or one that's

really just a semantic difference. So I think 10 11

that language preserves that in my view,

12 Mr. Hughes. And that's why I put it in that 13 disjunctive.

MR. HUGHES: I understand. And that was the only issue that we wanted to make with respect to the proposed instruction. Otherwise we believe it's fair and appropriate.

Again, to put in additional comment on burden of proof on particular issues, the jury already had the preliminary jury instructions that explain the state's burden of proof but -- on all elements of the case. The jury will be given those same instructions or similar instructions as to

24 burden of proof when the case is over.

On Rule 105, it doesn't talk about

reciting the whole litany of all the jury

instructions over and over again. It's a specific

rule that deals with the scope that a jury can give

4 a particular piece of evidence. And we believe

that the Court's proposed instruction other than

6 that one area, which I've made the record on,

7 targets that scope and targets Rule 105.

8 THE COURT: Address your other point too about

9 to the preface, because I think the preface is

10 necessary. I think the jury needs to be focused 11

right in on what we're talking about, not just

loosely sweat lodge ceremonies are going to think

13 back. It has to relate to what's happened in the

court in the last three days.

I think it's appropriate, and I think it 16 should be flagged that ultimately what's at issue is one sweat lodge ceremony. And there's a limited purpose they can consider this other evidence for if they wish. So I think the preface should be in there.

Mr. Li.

15

17

18

19

20

21

10

11

14

16

17

18

19

20

24

25

22 MR. LI: And by the "preface," you mean the --

23 the current -- as currently drafted or what's --

24 THE COURT: I think what -- Mr. Hughes still

didn't like the way I started -- I have mentioned

some evidence.

2 I think you were first suggesting that 3 should not be in there.

4 MR. HUGHES: No, Your Honor. I apologize. I

didn't express my opinion correctly. I heard

Mr. Li in his argument asking for the original

7 preface in the defendant's.

8 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Li, you were 9 speaking. Go ahead.

MR. LI: Your Honor, I will focus in on the last section. I mean, obviously we still believe 12 that there should be -- the Court did rule that the physical conditions were not sufficiently similar, et cetera, to put somebody on notice of substantial 15 risk of death in 2009. The Court did rule that.

And we think that there's no prejudice whatsoever to the state to actually put that into this instruction because that is, in fact, the law of the case.

The second point is, with respect to the 21 burden of proof, the state should embrace the 22 burden of proof. In fact, this is -- it is the law that the state must prove beyond a reasonable doubt the causation.

The Court, in fact, did not read the

- 1 causation instruction even though we requested the
- 2 causation instruction at the beginning of the case.
- 3 The state objected to the causation instruction.
- 4 It was never read to the jury. We think that there
- 5 has been a very big case now put up about
- 6 causation.

7 We now have had three days of testimony,

8 the sole purpose of which, as I understand the

- 9 state's theory, is causation. And we need to
- 10 instruct the jury about the law of causation.
- 11 There's absolutely no prejudice to the state to
- 12 tell the jurors that there is a burden of proof.
- 13 The state should embrace the burden of proof. It
- 14 is their constitutional obligation. They should --
- 15 they should absolutely embrace it.

And so as a consequence, Your Honor,

17 we -- I think the last paragraph -- the last

18 paragraph needs to have that concept, that the

19 state must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the

20 physical cause of death was heat stroke.

21 THE COURT: Well, what I -- what I will do is

22 put in a separate paragraph, just the general

23 statement that the state has the burden of proof as

24 to the elements of an offense or something like

that. That's what I think should be in there.

134

- MR. LI: May I make one point, Your Honor.
- 2 And I know --
- 3 THE COURT: Make your full record.
- 4 MR. LI: I know I'm stepping on your time, and
- 5 I don't want --
- 6 THE COURT: There's no problem with that,
- 7 Mr. Lı.

1

- 8 MR. LI: Okay.
- **9** THE COURT: Please feel free to make your
- 10 record.

11

- MR. LI: The problem is that in the beginning
- 12 of the case, we asked for a full causation
- 13 instruction which said that not only does the state
- 14 need to prove each element of the case beyond a
- 15 reasonable doubt, but with respect to causation,
- 16 they need to prove that there was not a
- 17 superseding, intervening cause, which we have now
- 18 put at issue in this case very firmly and to which
- 19 now the state is attempting to rebut by
- 20 purportedly -- I mean -- you know -- we all have
- 21 our difference about this. But by putting on
- 22 this prior act evidence.
- 23 And our --
- 24 THE COURT: That's okay.
- 25 MR. LI: By putting on these --

- 1 THE COURT: It may be prior act. It's -
 - again, we've had that discussion. But go ahead.
- 3 MR. LI: That they're putting on evidence
- 4 relating to prior sweat lodges, and that evidence
- purports to rebut our contention that the state has
- 6 failed its burden of proof in showing that a
- 7 superseding, intervening cause, for instance,
- 3 organophosphates or some other poison, caused these
- 9 people to die.
- 10 They have to prove, as the law holds
- 11 here -- and there's a jury instruction on point to
- 12 which the state objected to in the opening set.
- 13 There is a jury instruction that says the state
- 14 must not only prove causation, but they must prove
- 5 beyond a reasonable doubt that a superseding,
- 16 intervening cause did not cause the decedents to
- 17 die.

18

- And so to simply say well, there's a --
- 19 does the state have to prove each element beyond a
- 20 reasonable doubt is not enough because they have to
- 21 prove causation and they also have to prove that
- 22 nothing else caused it.
- 23 And so the way this instruction -- the
- 24 way our instruction was originally drafted is
- 25 Intended to recite what the law actually is, that

- the state now has put all this evidence in
- 2 purporting to address.
- 3 And so what we're concerned about, Your
- 4 Honor, is that while we appreciate the Court's
- 5 efforts in this -- in this instruction, we think it
- 6 needs to be more because if it doesn't say that,
- 7 then the jury may have confusion or
- 8 misunderstanding about what this evidence can
- 9 actually be used for. I think it needs to be
- 10 absolutely clear, Your Honor.
- 11 And the last thing, Your Honor, there's
- 12 no prejudice to the state to simply state what the
- 13 law is. Literally there is no prejudice. It is
- 14 the law.
- 15 THE COURT: And I mentioned before that the
- 16 instructing might -- it might be a process because
- 17 of some of the more complicated issues in the
- 18 ruling.
- 19 At this time I am going to put a reminder
- 20 in about the state's burden as to all elements of21 an offense. And with regard to putting -- you
- 22 know -- a special instruction in the
- 23 preliminaries -- I'm not saying just because it
- hasn't been done it shouldn't be. But you need to
- 25 see the evidence.

140

And you're saying, Mr. Li, well, there
 has been. And there has been.

3 So I will think of that. And it's
4 possible that there may be a supplement. But for
5 now I'm just going to add the one statement that
6 the state has -- well, give me the language for a
7 general statement.

MR. LI: Off the top of my head, Your Honor, it would be -- you know -- the state has the burden of proof to prove each and every element including causation beyond a reasonable doubt. I would then ask --

12 ask -13 THE COURT: But Mr. Hughes has hit the point
14 there. I made a very point clear to say we're
15 talking about physical cause here as opposed to
16 legal causation. And that's the problem, and
17 that's what's complicating it. So -18 MR. LI: Cause in fact. But, Your Honor,
19 that's exactly why this instruction should say that

18 MR. LI: Cause in fact. But, Your Honor,
19 that's exactly why this instruction should say that
20 the state has the burden to prove beyond a
21 reasonable doubt. You may only consider this in
22 deciding whether the state has met its burden -23 you know -- to prove beyond a reasonable doubt the
24 cause of death for the decedents was heat stroke
25 and not a different cause.

MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, there is a RAJI

2 instruction on causation. It's withstood scrutiny

3 quite a few times. And if the Court is inclined to

4 add a causation instruction to this, I would ask

5 that the RAJI causation instruction be provided.

6 THE COURT: And that's already been -- well,

7 it's not the instruction, but I mean, the whole

definition of beyond a reasonable doubt is there.

• 10 1 1 1 1 1

9 and it, essentially, has the Portillo language.

10 MR. HUGHES: And that would be the reasonable

11 doubt instruction. I believe it's --

12 THE COURT: Oh. Beyond a reasonable -- yeah.

13 They're combined. That's right. They're combined.

MR. LI: Off the top of my head, Your Honor, I

15 think it's 2.03, the causation, reasonable -- the

16 causation instruction is -- I believe it's 2.03,

17 2.03.

21

8

9

10

11

1

8

MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, again, I think
 there's a difference between the burden of proof
 instruction and the causation instruction.

THE COURT: There is.

MR. HUGHES: And I believe if there's going to be an addition, it should be the RAJI burden of

24 proof instruction. To go into the causation

25 instructions, I think at some point we might as

well just give them at end of trial the entire jury

2 instructions.

3 THE COURT: I'm not -- I'm not going to give a

4 causation instruction. It's confusing the

concepts. It's blurring the concepts to do that.

6 So that means -- what I'm going to do

7 is -- as I have provided it, that's -- the three

B paragraphs as I've given it, that's what I'm giving

9 at this time. I'm not going to add any additional

10 language.

11

17

Thank you.

12 Oh, just make a note that I am filing the

13 defense proposed instruction and the state's

14 proposed instruction. And, of course, the -- this

15 one will be filed as well. This will all be on

16 record.

Thank you.

18 (Recess.)

19 (Proceedings continued in the presence of

20 jury.)

21 THE COURT: The record will show the presence

22 of the defendant, Mr. Ray, the attorneys, and the

23 jury.

24

1

2

4

5

11

13

14

17

18

23

138

The witness, Ms. Mercer, has returned to

25 the witness stand and is under oath, of course.

MS. POLK: Thank you, Your Honor.

Ms. Polk, when you're ready.

Q. Good afternoon, Ms. Mercer.

A. Good afternoon.

Q. Right when we took our break, we were

6 finishing with the -- we were starting to talk

7 about the two ceremonies that were held at Angel

3 Valley in 2009. And you had testified that you had

9 a role at a ceremony in May of 2009?

10 A. Yes. I did.

Q. And that was a ceremony facilitated by

12 somebody other than Mr. Ray?

A. Yes, it was.

Q. With respect to that particular ceremony,

15 did you get a chance to observe the participants

16 before they went into the sweat lodge?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. And how did they look?

19 A. They looked happy, healthy, ready to do a

20 sweat lodge.

Q. Do you recall approximately how long that

22 ceremony lasted?

A. Maybe an hour, hour and a half.

Q. And were you present at the end of that

25 ceremony?

1 A. Yes.

4

5

8

- 2 Q. And did you get an opportunity to look at
- 3 the participants when the ceremony was over?
 - A. Yes, I did.
- Q. Did you see any participants while the
- 6 ceremony was going on?
- 7 A. Yes, I did.
 - Q. And how did they look?
- 9 A. They looked like they were having a good
- 10 time. They were in groups, singing, chanting,
- 11 talking, hugging.
- **Q.** Did you see the participants in that
- 13 ceremony when the ceremony was over?
- 14 A. Yes, I did.
- 15 Q. How did they look then?
- 16 A. Everyone -- the people I observed were
- 17 happy and grateful, a lot of hugging going on, a
- 18 lot of real eye contact, of feeling like it was a
- 19 spiritual connection, a lot of hugging and
- 20 gratitude.
- 21 MS. POLK: Your Honor, at this time the state
- 22 would request the reading of the instruction?
- 23 THE COURT: Mr. Kelly?
- 24 MR. KELLY: I agree.
- 25 THE COURT: Okay.
- Ladies and gentlemen, I have a special
 instruction to give you at this time. As I have
- 3 mentioned, some evidence is relevant only for
- 4 limited purposes.
- 5 In the past three days, you have heard
- 6 evidence of circumstances at sweat lodge ceremonies
- 7 that took place prior to the 2009 sweat lodge
- 8 ceremony, which is the only sweat lodge ceremony
- 9 that is at issue in this case.
- 10 You must not consider any of that
- 11 evidence regarding prior sweat lodge ceremonies, if
- 12 believed, to draw any inference regarding Mr. Ray's
- 13 knowledge of any risk of death in 2009. You also
- 14 must not consider that evidence regarding prior
- 15 sweat lodge ceremonies, if believed, to draw any
- 16 inference regarding Mr. Ray's intent, character, or
- 17 conduct in 2009.
- 18 You may only consider that evidence from
- 19 those prior sweat lodge ceremonies, if believed, as
- to chose prior swede loage ceremonies, in believed, a
- 20 it may relate to whether the physical cause of
- 21 death of the decedents was heat stroke or some
- 22 other physical cause.
- 23 MS. POLK: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 24 Q. Ms. Mercer, I'd like to now talk about
- 25 October 8th of 2009. Were you present at Angel

- 1 Valley on that date?
 - A. Yes, I was.
- **Q.** And were you present at the site of the
- 4 sweat lodge?

2

5

8

11

18

21

25

1

142

141

- A. Yes, I was.
- **Q.** And tell the jury who facilitated that
- 7 sweat lodge ceremony.
 - A. James Ray International.
- **Q.** Will you tell the jury what your role was
- 10 for that ceremony.
 - A. I was the door keeper for that sweat
- 12 lodge.
- 13 Q. I'm going to put up on the overhead
- 14 Exhibit 145. Do you see yourself in this
- 15 photograph?
- 16 A. Yes, I do.
- **Q.** Will you show the jury where you are.
 - A. That is me.
- 19 Q. And do you recall what was happening when
- 20 this photograph was taken?
 - A. I don't recall, but I can tell.
- 22 Q. What can you tell?
- 23 A. We were holding the energy of the sweat
- 24 lodge.
 - Q. What does that mean?

- A. Because it's a spiritual ceremony, the
- energy is created in the sacred space beforehand to
- 3 not let any negative energy in. And then we hold
- 4 the energy for the participants in the sweat lodge
- 5 of love and caring and compassion and -- and just
- 6 try and surround it with love and good energy.
- 7 That's what I was doing. I'm not sure if that's
- 8 what a Native American sweat lodge is, but that's
- 9 what I was doing.
- 10 Q. Okay. Do you know the other people who
- 11 are seen in this photograph? I just underlined a
- 12 couple.
- 13 A. They look like all Dream Team. I see
- 14 Ted.
- **Q.** Where's Ted?
- 16 A. Right here drinking water. I can't tell.
- 17 That might be Anita in the back, but I'm not sure.
- 18 Q. Did you know the other Dream Team members
- **19** before this event started?
- 20 A. Oh, I've seen them and -- but I only knew
- 21 Megan by name. They always wore -- mainly they
- 22 wore blue shirts. So that's how you identified
- 23 them.
- **Q.** Who did you understand Megan to be?
- 25 A. James Ray's assistant. And Josh.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 145 to 148 of 210

participants were?

Α.

Q.

Α.

Q.

Α.

Q.

A.

today when this photograph was taken where the

And do you recall how they got inside?

Where were you as they were going in?

At -- I was at the door. I'm trying to

They were inside.

Did you see them go in?

remember if I helped in the saging process.

They --

Yes, I did.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

37 of 53 sheets

Q.

Α.

first position.

Α.

Q.

ceremony?

Do you know where Mr. Ray sat during the

He sat to the right of the door in the

Will you show the jury where Mr. Ray sat.

I'm going to put up on the overhead

Exhibit 414, which is just a simple diagram. Do

you see where the entrance is on that exhibit?

Yes, I do.

Here.

- Because the people would stand outside the sacred space, get saged, and then walk in -- and then go 2 3 in the lodge. And I was at the door.
 - Q. Do you recall how long it took the participants to get inside the sweat lodge?
- 6 Α. At this one?
- 7 Q. Yes.
 - Α. No.
- 9 Q. And once everybody was in, what would
- 10 happen next? What -- let's start at the beginning
- 11 of the ceremony. You testified that people got
- 12 saged?

8

- 13 Α. Yes.
- 14 Q. Now, were you aware of a gathering at
- 15 another fire by participants before they went in?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 **Q.** And where were you when that went on?
- 18 Α. I believe I was in the sacred space. I
- 19 don't remember if that year he called us over to 20 join in the -- or be around -- because they would
- 21 have a circle and talk and then burn their
- 22 intentions. I can't recall if that year I was
- 23 standing around there or if I was at the fire.
- 24 Q. Okay. And then from the burning of the
- 25 intentions, what did the participants do?
- 150

149

1

2

8

17

18

25

7

16

17

21

23

- A. Then they would go into the lodge. 1
- 2 **Q.** Once they were in, what happened next?
- 3 Α. James would call for grandfathers.
- 4 Q. When the participants went in, were there
- 5 any rocks inside the sweat lodge?
- 6 Α. No.
- 7 Q. Do you recall, then, before that
- 8 beginning of the first round the door would still
- 9 be open before Mr. Ray calls for the rocks?
- A. Yes. The door is open. I mean, 10 11 everybody gets in, and then he calls for rocks, and 12 the rocks are put in, and then the door is closed.
- 13 When Mr. Ray calls for rocks for the 14 first round, are you the person who was being
- 15 spoken to?
- 16 A. Yeah. He kind of yelled it so Ted could 17 hear it. But yeah. Usually I'll repeat it to Ted and go over and say 10 or 12 or whatever it was he 18 19 wanted.
- 20 Q. Do you recall how many grandfathers or 21 how many rocks Mr. Ray called for to start the
- 22 sweat lodge ceremony?
- 23 Α. I believe it was 10 or 12.
- 24 Who was helping, then, pull the rocks out
- 25 of the fire and get them into the pit?

- Α. Rotillo.
- Q. Was your daughter --
- 3 Ted. And Sarah was helping dust the 4 rocks off and then move them into the sweat lodge.
 - Do you see the area on this photograph of
- 5 where rocks were dusted off?
- 6
- 7 Α. Yes, I do.
 - Q. Can you show us?
- 9 Uh-huh.
- 10 Let's see if I can zoom in on that.
- 11 It's just, like, a rock that we could put
- the hot lava rock on and then -- yeah. See?
- There's the pitchfork. I don't see the broom, 13
- though. It's just a little -- you know -- hand
- 15 whisk broom. And you would just brush off the
- 16 ashes, the hot ashes.
 - Q. So while that's going on, where were you?
 - I would be moving between getting the
- 19 rocks from the dusting off area. I'd be back and
- 20 forth in this area.
- 21 Q. In between rounds?
- 22 Α. Uh-huh.
- 23 Q. And then once the rounds started, where
- 24 would you go?
 - To the door.
 - 152

Q. Where was the water that was used inside

- the sweat lodge?
- 3 Α. Right here.
- 4 Q. Who was filling up those buckets for this
- ceremony?
- 6 A. Ted or I.
 - Q. How did you fill up those buckets?
- 8 Where the hose -- well, the spigot was
- 9 actually way back over here, but we dragged the
- hose all the way around. Actually, we had one
- 11 going that way and one going this way.
- 12 Did you -- do you know who it was,
- Ms. Mercer, who -- once the rocks are in the pit,
- 14 do you know who it was who then would pour water on
- 15 the rocks?
 - A. James Ray.
 - Q. And did you see him do that?
- 18 Α. No. That was usually done when the door
- 19 was closed. I could hear it, though, and I
- 20 could --
 - Q. Tell the jury what you could hear.
- 22 Well -- and it was unusual because --
 - MR. KELLY: Your Honor, I would object. It's
- 24 nonresponsive.
- 25 THE COURT: Sustained.

Α.

different question.

We did not.

Are you able to recall today the first

round of Mr. Ray's 2009 ceremony? I'll ask you a

22

23

24

25

22

23

24

25

Q.

happening? The second round.

When that round ended, what do you recall

sweat lodge. And during the time we were getting

Oh, I would say 12 people came out of the

23

24

Q.

Α.

Q.

Yes.

He was laying right about here.

That person who was screaming -- were you

1

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

his Dream Team members?

Yes.

About that girl?

Α.

Q.

Α.

- 1 the sweat lodge?
- 2 A. I can't recall. I probably drug him out.
- But I don't recall. I just I just remembered
- 4 him screaming.
 - **Q.** And what do you remember him saying?
- 6 A. He was screaming he was going to die. He
- 7 didn't want to die. And he was having a heart
- 8 attack. And things were getting dark. And that
- 9 kind of thing. But really screaming and really
- 10 loud.

- 11 Q. Do you know the name of that person?
- 12 A. No.
- **Q.** Was the door to the sweat lodge open or
- 14 closed when you --
- 15 A. It was open.
- **16 Q.** Where was Mr. Ray?
- 17 A. Directly inside the door.
- 18 Q. Did you hear Mr. Ray say anything to that
- 19 man?
- 20 A. Yes, I did.
- 21 Q. What do you recall Mr. Ray saying?
- 22 A. I recall him asking, who is that? What's
- 23 that noise out there? And I didn't -- he was
- 24 looking at me. And I didn't know the person's
- 25 name. And I said, someone was -- someone was
 - 162
- 1 having an -- or someone was hurt or -- someone
- 2 calling for help. I don't know who it was.
- 3 And then one of the Dream Team came over
- 4 and said it was so-and-so and told James it's
- 5 so-and-so. And James got real loud and directed
- 6 him, like, the same things. You're more than that.
- 7 It's a good day to die. You'll be okay.
- **Q.** Where was --
- 9 A. I remember saying, it's a good day to
- 10 live.
- 11 Q. Did you say that out loud?
- 12 A. Yes, I did.
- 13 Q. Who did you direct that to?
- 14 A. James Ray.
- **Q.** Did he respond to you?
- 16 A. No.
- **Q.** And did Mr. Ray ever come out of the
- 18 sweat lodge to check up on the man before he said
- 19 that?
- 20 A. No.
- 21 Q. Did you -- do you know what happened to
- 22 that man? Did you focus on him or track him?
- 23 A. No
- 24 Q. Did you become aware of a man who had
- **25** fallen into the pit?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Do you recall when that was?
- A. I don't think it was during -- I -- my
- recollection is I thought the door had just closed
- and -- because I heard somebody saying, no. Stop
- 6 him. And then I heard a commotion and then, open
- 7 the door. Open the door. And then a gentleman
- 8 came out with a burned arm, skin hanging off of his
- 9 arm.

161

1

2

- 10 Q. Do you recall who said, open the door?
- 11 Open the door?
- 12 A. It was several people.
- 13 Q. It was not Mr. Ray?
- 14 A. He could have -- I mean, he could have.
- 15 But it was more that there was obvious a commotion.
- 16 Q. Did you open the door then?
- 17 A. Yes.

18

24

25

1

2

- Q. And did you see how the man got out?
- 19 A. I think he was crawling.
- 20 Q. Did you see if anybody was assisting him?
- 21 A. I don't think so.
- 22 Q. What did you ---
- 23 A. Not that I recall.
 - Q. Do you know that man's name?
 - A. No.
 - Q. And did you see where that man went?

164

- A. Yes.
- **Q.** Where did he go?
- 4 A. He went and sat over on a tarp on the
- 5 side.
- **Q.** Did you get a chance to see the man's arm
- 7 or body?
- 8 A. Yes, I did.
- **Q.** And describe for the jury what you saw.
- 10 A. I saw skin coming off of his -- what
- 11 appeared to be skin coming off of arm all -- you
- 12 know -- like, all right here and on his hand. And
- 13 then one of the Dream Team put a towel around it
- 14 and that I knew that's not a good thing to do to
- 15 a burn.
- 16 And at the same time, Fawn said, get that
- 17 off of it, and she ran and got a bucket of ice
- water, and he put his whole arm into the bucket ofice water that Fawn brought.
- 20 Q. When Fawn went to get the bucket of ice
- 21 water, where were you?
- 22 A. At the door.
 - Q. Do you recall when the next round started
- 24 in relationship to Fawn going to get the water?
- A. It started -- I believe it started

2

3

5

9

11

21

24

2

5

8

11

- shortly after that. I can't recall. There wasn't 1 2 a long delay before it started.
- 3 Did Mr. Ray ever come out to check up on the man with the burned arm?
- Α. No.
- Q. 6 Did he start the next round?
- 7 Α. Yes.
- 8 Q. Are you able to recall the number of
- 9 rocks specifically today that Mr. Ray called for
- 10 for his rounds?
- 11 A. Like, right now I couldn't say -- you
- know -- what each round was. But I know that 12
- generally they were above 8, except for one round I 13
- think he did 4. But they were -- the majority were 14
- 8, 10, 12. 15
- 16 Q. And do you recall specifically how many
- 17 rocks Mr. Ray called for for his last round? If
- vou recall. 18
- 19 A. I don't recall, but I -- it was more than
- the -- when he said four, I thought he was going to 20 21 keep them low, but then they went high again.
- 22 Did you pay attention to the man with the
- 23 burned arm after that?
- 24 Α. No.
- 25 Q. Do you know if he ever went back inside
- 166

- 1 the sweat lodge?
- 2 Α. I did see him go back in the lodge.
- 3 Q. When was that?
- 4 A. The last round.
- 5 Q. Do you know whether Mr. Ray said anything
- 6 to the man as he went back in for the last round?
- 7 Α. No, I don't.
- 8 Q. Did you at some point -- I guess you've
- 9 testified that you dragged people out from out --
- 10 from the sweat lodge over to the tarps?
 - Α. Yes, I did.

11

15

21

- 12 And before the sweat lodge was over, so
- 13 during the ceremony in between rounds, how many
- 14 people did you drag out and take over to tarps?
 - Α. **During the whole lodge?**
- 16 Q. Yes. Not -- not counting what happened
- 17 afterwards, but just the whole ceremony itself.
- 18 I would say I dragged out probably 10, I
- 19 assisted probably 25.
- 20 Did you ever drag out anybody who was
- unconscious before the ceremony was over? 22 MR. KELLY: Your Honor, object to the form.
- 23 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 24 BY MS. POLK: Did you ever drag out --
- let me ask you this: For the 10 that you dragged

- 1 out, why did you drag them out?
 - A. They were passed out.
 - And how did you become aware that they
- 4 needed your assistance to get out?
 - Somebody would drag them to the door.
- 6 And then I would take them from the door out. And
- 7 they were there motionless, passed out. I would
- 8 take them out the door.
 - Q. And where were you put them?
- 10 Over to the side.
 - Q. And for those 10 people that you dragged
- out who were motionless, how close were those 10
- 13 people to Mr. Ray?
- 14 A. They were always directly in front of
- 15 him. Because the direction that you were supposed
- 16 to exit was going back around in front of him. So
- 17 to leave the lodge, you had to -- to leave the
- 18 lodge in the proper fashion that he indicated, you
- 19 had to pass in front of James Ray.
- 20 Do you recall whether Mr. Ray ever said
 - anything about the 10 people that you dragged out
- 22 who were passed out?
- 23 Α. No.
 - Q. At some point could you hear a
- conversation inside the sweat lodge concerning a
- 1 particular person?
 - Α. I heard several conversations.
- 3 The first conversation that you heard --
- 4 about when was it?
 - Α. By the fifth or sixth round.
- 6 Q. Where were you when you heard this
- 7 conversation?
 - Α. At the door.
- 9 Q. Was the door open or closed?
- 10 Α. It was open.
 - **Q.** And tell the jury what you heard.
- 12 Α. I heard somebody tell James that -- I
- 13 heard a man tell James Ray that somebody, who I
- 14 guess was next to them, was not doing so well. And
- 15 James said, really?
- 16 And they said, yeah. I can't get her to
- 17 respond.
- 18 And James said, she -- I don't know if
- 19 these are the exact words, but to the effect of,
- 20 she's been down this road before. She'll be okay.
- 21 Q. Where were you when you heard that
- 22 conversation?
- 23 A. At the door.
- 24 Q. And could you see inside who was
- 25 speaking?

Page 165 to 168 of 210

A. I can't say exactly, but it was normal

within the sweat lodge about a person needing to

Did you ever hear any conversations from

interval. So six to eight minutes.

22

23

24

22

23

24

take further.

Q.

you're talking about?

How do you know it was Mr. Shore that

I remember the face.

- 1 Q. Do you know who it was that Mr. Shore 2 brought to the door?
- 3 Α. No.
- 4 Q. And was it male or female?
- 5 Α. Couldn't tell you.
- Q. 6 How close to the door did Mr. Shore bring 7 that person?
- 8 Α. He came from this way and to the -- right 9 about here.
- 10 Q. And what did you do then?
- 11 A. And then I took the person from him and took him outside. 12
- 13 Q. Where did you take the person?
- 14 Α. Over to that -- to that same area on --15 on the tarps.
- 16 Q. Was that person alert?
- 17 A. No.
- 18 Q. Describe to the jury what you remember
- about the person that Mr. Shore brought to the 19
- 20 door.
- 21 Α. I don't remember anything other than a person that -- them being passed out and me moving 23 them over there.
- 24 Q. And after you dragged them over to a side 25 away from the door, what did you do?
 - I went back to the door to see if there Α.
- 2 was anymore -- I think someone else came out after 3 that, and James went back in.
- Q. 4 James Shore?
- 5 Α. Yes. James Shore.
- 6 Q. Did you see James Shore as he went back
- 7 ın?

11

1

- 8 Α. Yeah.
- 9 Q. And did you see anything in particular
- 10 about him?
- Α. I know -- well, when he got to this point 12 when he was bringing someone, he knocked his head
- 13 on a tree -- on the top of a -- because he tried to
- 14 stand up and he knocked his head. So he had a
- 15 little scratch on his head.
- Q. 16 Where was Mr. Ray when you saw Mr. Shore 17 bump his head?
- 18
 - Α. Right here.
- 19 As you took the person from James Shore, 20 did you see what James Shore did?
- 21 A.
- No. I don't recall.
- After bumping his head, did James Shore 22 Q. 23 come out of the sweat lodge?
- 24 I remember seeing him go back in. I think he -- my recollection is he went -- he never

- came out totally out right then. He went back in.
- And I don't -- I don't remember him out -- in here.
- 3 I remember him in here.
- 4 Okay. Did you hear anymore conversations
- 5 coming from the sweat lodge during the ceremony?
 - Α. Yes.

6

8

14

17

- 7 Q. And tell the jury what else you heard.
 - Before the last round -- before the last
- 9 round, I heard somebody in this area over here -- I
- 10 heard him say so-and-so is not breathing or they're 11 not responding. I can't get him to respond.
- 12 Do you recall if that was a male or a
- 13 female voice saying so-and-so is not breathing?
 - Α. I can't recall.
- 15 Q. Do you recall if that voice used the name
- 16 of the person who was not breathing?
 - Yeah. They did.
- 18 Q. Do you remember the name?
- 19 Α.
- 20 Q. What do you recall the person saying
- about someone not breathing?
- 22 MR. KELLY: Your Honor, objection. Misstates
- 23 her testimony. The response was "not responding."
- 24 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 25 Q. BY MS. POLK: You can go ahead and
- 1 answer.
- 2 What do you recall the voice saying that
- 3 you heard from this area?
- I'm sorry. I'm getting emotional. I
- remember them saying -- I can't recall right now.
- 6 My brain -- can I review my transcript or
- 7 something?

- Q. You can. Would you -- do you -- would
- you like to take a little break?
- 10 A. Yeah. I think my brain is getting fried.
- 11 THE COURT: We'll take a recess.
- 12 Ladies and gentlemen, we'll go ahead and
- 13 take an afternoon recess. Again, we'll probably be
- 14 recessing a little bit before 4:00, in any event.
- 15 So please be back in 15 minutes. Remember the
- 16 admonition.
- 17 Ms. Mercer, just remember that rule of
- 18 exclusion.
- 19 Thank you. We're in recess.
- 20 (Recess.)
- 21 (Proceedings continued outside presence
- 22 of jury.)
- 23 THE COURT: The record will show the presence
- 24 of Mr. Ray and the attorneys.
- 25 Mr. Kelly.

179

180

MR. KELLY: Judge, right before the break I 1 2 objected to a question asked by Ms. Polk and --3 MR. LI: I have it. MR. KELLY: Well, now my note keeps scrolling 4 upwards. I don't know how to get it back. 6 Judge, here's the problem -- I'm going to 7 summarize. And you're looking at the actual testimony, but --8 9 THE COURT: What do you recall the person saying about someone not breathing? That question? 10 MR. KELLY: And the witness said, I can't 11 12 recall. And then in the next question there's an 13 improper form of the question. And it says, do you know the name of the person who was not breathing? 14

That was not the witness's testimony. And then she responds by saying, I don't know her name. And it's importing an improper and critical fact in this case by misstating the response. I objected based on the fact that it

misstates the evidence. Then we took a break. And, again, Judge, it's like I mentioned this morning, these continued improper form of questions, somewhat leading questions, is creating a significant concern.

THE COURT: Mr. Kelly, let me go through the

178

```
question. It says, do you recall -- you know.
2
        THE REPORTER: Do you want me to read it?
3
       THE COURT: Can you do that?
```

THE REPORTER: Sure. 4

5 MR. KELLY: If I may, Judge, just to focus on 6 the transcript. What I recall the initial question

7 was something like, did you hear something from

8 this location on Exhibit 140?

9 THE COURT: Something about a voice saying so-and-so is not breathing. Is that -- the witness 10 11 says, I can't recall.

Do you recall if that voice used the name 12 13 of the person who was not breathing?

Yeah. They did.

Do you recall the name?

16 No.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

14

15

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Is this in the area? 17

MR. KELLY: Right. So the question keeps implying that the response is that she hears the person -- she hears the statement that the female is not breathing. And that's not the case.

MR. LI: Your Honor, I actually remember the record. Where it is is actually a few questions before and --

THE COURT: Let me scroll up.

1 MR. LI: The question is, did you hear

2 anything inside there?

3 The witness says something to the effect 4 of, I heard somebody say she -- someone's not -so-and-so is not breathing or not responding. I

6 don't recall.

7 And then the next question from Ms. Polk 8 is, when you heard somebody say that somebody wasn't breathing, what -- you know -- what did you do next? Or something like that. 10

11 THE COURT: Okay. Yeah. I see what you mean, 12 Mr. Li. The objection came sometime later. But it 13 was, did you hear any more conversations coming

14 from the sweat lodge during the ceremony?

Yes.

15

21

24

16 And tell the jury what else you heard.

17 Something last round. I heard somebody in this area over here. I heard him say so-and-so 18 19 is not breathing or they're not responding. I

20 can't get him to respond.

> Okay. Do you recall if that female voice saying so-and-so is not breathing?

23 I can't recall.

Oh. Mr. Kelly, you did say it was not

responding. And I just -- I didn't get -- it was

almost a screen or so above, and I didn't see that.

So -- no. It's a rather important -- it's very,

very significant -- you know -- distinction. That

needs to be -- that needs to be addressed. It

does. Not breathing and not responding is

tremendous -- tremendous difference. 7

You heard me go through that, Ms. Polk,

8 and --

13

9 MS. POLK: I do. But I don't understand the 10 objection.

11 THE COURT: Well, your questioning of what do you recall the person saying about someone not

breathing, and the initial response started out,

14 not breathing but then was revised to not

15 responding. That was -- that was the distinction.

16 And I've told the jurors before on these

17 things -- you know -- listen to the question

18 closely. But when I looked up, I saw a number of

questions about breathing before the objection. 19

And by that time it had lost the train of it being 20 21 changed from breathing to responding.

22 So the prior testimony was not that the 23 person was not breathing. It was really that she

24 was not responding.

MS. POLK: And, Your Honor, when she gets back 25

- 1 on the stand, I'll start over and just have her
- 2 talk about the conversations. But what I
- 3 understood her to say is that what she heard was
- 4 so-and-so is not breathing or not responding. Not
- 5 that she was saying the person -- she wasn't
- 6 correcting herself. She was just saying she heard
- 7 a conversation about somebody not breathing or not
- 8 responding. That's the way I understood it.
- 9 THE COURT: I heard her say so-and-so is not
- 10 breathing or they're not responding.
- 11 MS. POLK: Correct.
- 12 THE COURT: And your follow-up questions
- 13 became, though, like it was all not breathing.
- 14 MS. POLK: Well -- and I'll -- Your Honor,
- 15 I'll go back when she gets back on and just ask her
- 16 open-ended questions about what she heard.
- 17 MR. KELLY: Judge, that's my point. It's
- **18** direct examination. It needs to be a series of
- 19 open-ended question without emphasizing or
- 20 repeating the response from the witness as to each
- 21 and every prior question.
- 22 And in this particular circumstance is
- 23 extremely critical. But it happens repeatedly
- 24 where Ms. Polk summarizes the response from the
- 25 previous question and in asking the next question.
- 1 We go through that. And when it's critical
- 2 testimony like this, it can be highly prejudicial.
- 3 My second concern, Judge, is that under
- 4 801(d)(2), statements of my client are admissible
- 5 clearly but not generalized with what a witness
- 6 believes the statement may be. And there are
- 7 specific statements only admissible.
- 8 THE COURT: Mr. Kelly, the point does need to
- 9 be clarified. I agree.
- 10 Looking at these questions, though,
- 11 sometimes if you don't put some kind of label on
- 12 there or some kind of identifier -- and I agree if
- 13 It's repeated, there -- there's been repetition of
- 14 certain points.
- 15 But Ms. Polk, you indicated you will pick
- **16** up that and clarify that.
- 17 If you're talking about two or three
- 18 persons and you're talking about who might be
- 19 speaking --
- 20 Ms. Polk, you understand the point.
- 21 We'll bring the jury in. Thank you.
- 22 (Proceedings continued in the presence of
- 23 jury.)
- 24 THE COURT: The record will show the presence
- 25 of Mr. Ray, the attorneys, and the jury.

- 1 Ms. Mercer has returned to the stand.
- 2 Ms. Polk.
- 3 MS. POLK: Thank you, Your Honor.
- **Q.** Ms. Mercer, I'm going to show you some
 - more photographs. This is Exhibit 511, 527 --
- 6 And Your Honor, can I ask if 527 has been 7 admitted?
- 8 THE COURT: I'll check that.
- **9** 527 has not.
- MR. KELLY: No objection to 527.
- 11 THE COURT: Then 527 is admitted.
- 12 (Exhibit 527 admitted.)
- 13 Q. BY MS. POLK: I'm also going to show you
- 14 319 and just ask you, first of all, if you
- 15 recognize what's in these photographs.
- 16 A. Yes, I do.
- 17 Q. And you had testified about James Shore
- 18 bumping his head?
 - A. Yes.

19

5

16

182

- **Q.** Are you able to see in these photographs
- 21 the area inside the sweat lodge where Mr. Shore
- 22 bumped his head?
- 23 A. From the inside picture you can't see
- 24 because this looks like it's towards the back. But
- 25 it's -- he bumped into one of those.
- 184
- 1 Q. Okay. I'll put them up on the overhead
- 2 and see if you can show the jury.
- 3 First of all, I'll put up the
- 4 Exhibit 319. And what do you recognize that to be?
 - A. That's the door.
- **Q.** And are you able to show the jury using
- 7 this photograph where James Shore was when he
- 8 bumped his head?
- 9 A. He was inside the lodge. I would say
- 10 about right here.
- 11 Q. And I'm going to put up on the overhead
- 12 Exhibit 527. Do you recognize what part of the
- 13 sweat lodge this is?
- 14 A. That actually looks -- I mean, it's
- 15 inside the lodge.
 - Q. What did James Shore bump his head on?
- 17 A. One of these sticks going across the top.
- 18 Q. I was asking you about what you heard
- 19 from inside the sweat lodge. Did you hear a
- 20 conversation during Mr. Ray's ceremony about the
- 21 participants inside?
- 22 A. Yes, I did.
 - Q. How many conversations did you hear?
- 24 A. Two.
 - Q. And have you already testified about one?

23

- 1 remember what he said. And then he walked by the
- 2 guy who was thought he was dying and said
- 3 something to him. And then he went and sat down in
 - the shade on the chairs.
- 5 Q. You've testified about other people
- 6 crawling or needing assistance?
- A. Yes.

7

8

- Q. Did Mr. Ray crawl or need assistance?
- 9 A. No.
- 10 Q. Did you hear what he said to the guy?
- 11 You said he stopped and spoke to a participant.
- 12 Did you hear what he said?
- 13 MR. KELLY: Your Honor, I'm going object.
- 14 It's been asked and answered. She couldn't recall.
- 15 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 16 If you can, answer that, personal
- 17 knowledge.
- 18 THE WITNESS: I don't remember the exact
- 19 words, but something to the effect --
- 20 MR. KELLY: Same objection.
- 21 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 22 THE WITNESS: No. I don't recall.
- 23 Q. BY MS. POLK: Okay. After Mr. Ray came
- 24 out, what happened? Did other people come out?
- 25 A. Other people exited the sweat lodge.
- 190

- 1 Q. And what did you do?
- 2 A. We would -- I would direct them to stay
- 3 low and crawl over to an area away from the fire.
- 4 Because the concern was people coming out would go
- 5 into the fire area. So and a lot of times they
- 6 would come from down low and hot and stand up. So
- 7 I'd ask them to stay low so they could get to
- 8 the tarps.
- 9 Q. Did you assist anybody come out the
- 10 front?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. And did you go inside the sweat lodge to
- 13 assist anybody?
- 14 A. No.
- **Q.** Describe for the jury how you assisted
- 16 people out the front.
- 17 A. Again, people would -- somebody inside
- 18 the sweat lodge would drag them to the door. And
- 19 then I would take them from the door over to the
- 20 side area outside of the lodge.
- 21 Q. Do you recall how many people you did
- 22 that for?
- 23 A. How many people I dragged out?
- **Q.** After the ceremony was over.
- 25 A. All together?

- 1 Q. After the ceremony was over how many you
- 2 dragged out from the front.
- 3 A. Well, I dragged out at least four that
- 4 were passed out. I assisted in carrying other
- 5 people out that you know -- just couldn't get
- 6 their legs to move or -- you know -- they
- 7 weren't -- yeah. They couldn't get their body to
- move, so we'd help them out. I mean, they weren't
- 9 passed out, but they couldn't move.
- 10 Q. For the four people that were passed out,
- 11 do you recall if they were male or female?
- 12 A. No.
- 13 Q. And where did you take those four people?
- 14 A. To the side -- the area of the tarps.
- 15 Q. Was anybody helping you drag out those
- 16 people?
- 17 A. Ted and Sarah.
- 18 Q. Are you able to drag out somebody on your
- 19 own without assistance?
- 20 A. It depends on how big they are.
- 21 Sometimes yes.
- **Q.** Were there some that you could not drag
- 23 out on your own?
 - A. Yes.
- 25 Q. After assisting the people, that you've
 - 1 just described for the jury, out of the front, what
- 2 did you do?

24

5

14

- 3 A. I looked inside.
- **Q.** Why did you look inside?
 - A. I don't know. Something made me look
- 6 inside.
- 7 Q. And I'm going to put back up on the
- 8 overhead Exhibit 319. When -- are you able to see
- 9 inside when the door is opened?
- 10 A. You can see a little bit more than this.
- 11 Like, if the camera was directly in front -- you
- 12 know -- you can see that you know -- this
- 13 general area directly in. But that's all you can
 - see.
- 15 I mean, when the door was open, I put my
- 16 head -- after the lodge I put my head inside, and I
- 17 could see three people in there.
- **Q.** Ms. Mercer, how much time would you say
- 19 had passed from the end of that ceremony to the
- 20 time that you looked inside and saw three people?
- 21 A. 15 minutes.
- **Q.** 15 minutes. And during that 15 minutes
- 23 what was going on?
 - A. We were getting other people out. The
- 25 lodge was emptying.

- 193 1 Q. Did you observe Mr. Ray during those 15 1 where you lifted. 2 minutes? 2 I ran around the back here, and I lifted 3 Α. He went and sat in a chair and staved on the backside, right here on the back. 3 there. 4 4 Q. And then what happened? 5 Q. When you looked in, then tell the jury 5 Well, it's hard to get -- in the 6 what you saw. 6 construction of the sweat lodge, you put blankets 7 7 Α. I saw three people in the back of the on top of each other and then tarps. So you can't 8 sweat lodge laying there. 8 just lift it up and the whole thing is exposed. 9 Q. I'm going to put back up the diagram. 9 You lift one and there's another laver and another 10 Show the jury where you saw people. layer, and they're around it. So it doesn't come 10 11 I saw two people here and one person 11 up easily. And the rocks are holding the tarps 12 here. 12 down. 13 Q. What did you then do? 13 So I had to move the rocks out of the way 14 Α. I was kneeling down, and I looked around 14 and attempt to pull the tarp and the blankets up. 15 for someone to help because I knew I couldn't go in 15 And I couldn't do it myself, so I started -- I 16 the lodge bending over and drag them out. So I 16 called for help. 17 17 looked for someone to help me. Q. And what did you say when you called for 18 Q. How did you look for someone to help you? 18 help? 19 A. I turned my head and looked around. 19 Α. I was screaming, help. 20 Q. Did you find anybody? 20 Q. Did somebody come to help you? 21 Α. Everyone I saw was helping someone else. 21 Α. My daughter was with me. 22 22 So -- and I looked over and I saw James Ray. And I Q. And that's Sarah? 23 said, there's three people in there. I need to get 23 And then what did you and Sarah do? 24 them out. Can I - I said, I can't get in there. 24 Α. We lifted up the back of the tarps. 25 I'm going to open the back. 25 Q. And what did you see? 194 1 Did Mr. Ray respond to you? 1 Α. We saw two people laying there. 2 A. Yes, he did. 2 Q. And what did you do? They were -- their lips were blue. Their 3 I'm going to put back up Exhibit 145. 3 4 Just show the jury the area where Mr. Ray was 5 seated when you spoke to him. 5 they're holding hands. 6 Α. 6 It's not in the picture. 7 Q. 7 And will you just indicate what side it out of there. 8 8 ıs. 9 Over here. There was a canopy, a shaded 9 10 canopy, set up with chairs. And he was sitting in 10 11 11 the chair in the shade out of the sacred space. Q. 12 When you told Mr. Ray you were going to 12 female? 13 open up the back, what did he -- did he respond to 13 Α. 14 you? 14 MS. POLK: Your Honor, counsel stipulates to 15 Α. Yes, he did. 15 Exhibit 522. 16 Q. And what did he say? 16 THE COURT: 522 is admitted.
- 17 Α. He said, no, unless it's absolutely
- 18 necessary.
- 19 And I said, I can't get in there. And so 20 I went around to the back.
 - And then what did you do?
- 22 Α. I lifted up the -- the -- lifted up the
- 23 back covers of the lodge.
- 24 And on the photograph we now have on the 25 overhead, can you just show the jury the direction

- faces were white. And my daughter said, Mama,
- And I said, I know. We have to get them
- And then I called for help again, and somebody came over to the side and held up the tarps. And Sarah and I pulled them out.
- Do you remember if they were male and
- There was one male and one female.
- - (Exhibit 522 admitted.)
- 18 Q. BY MS. POLK: I know this is hard.
- 19 Α. Yeah.
- 20 Q. I just want to show you 522 and ask if
- 21 you recognize that?
- 22 Α. Yes.
 - Q. And what do you recognize that to be?
- 24 A. It looks like the inside of the sweat
- 25 lodge where I pulled them up, where they would have

21

17

- been before I pulled them out. 1
- 2 Q. I'm going to put 522 on the overhead and
- just ask if you can show the jury -- well, tell the 4 jury what this is.
 - Α. This would be where the people we saw were laying.
- 7 Q. Does this show --
- 8 Α. Where we lifted up the tarps.
- 9 And are you able on this photograph to
- 10 orient yourself as to where the people were lying?
- Α. 11 I think so.
- 12 Q. Will you show the jury.
- Α. 13 They would have been lying here and here.
- 14 Q. Were you and Sarah able to pull out the
- man and the woman? 15
- Α. 16 Right there we were. Yes. Those two.
- 17 Q. And then what happened?
- 18 Α. There was another guy. And we went to
- 19 get him.

6

- 20 **Q.** Do you -- are you able to show the jury
- 21 on this photograph where the other man was?
- 22 A. It's about over here where the other
- 23 light is coming through. Because we ripped the
- 24 tarp open over there.
- 25 Q. Again, from the outside?
- 198

- 1 Α. Uh-huh.
- 2 Q. And then were you able to pull that man
- 3 out?
- 4 Α. No. He was too big for Sarah and I. And
- 5 I don't know who helped -- I don't know who helped
- 6 pull him out.
- 7 Q. Okay. What do you remember next,
- 8 Mrs. Mercer?
- 9 I remember going back -- looking at the
- 10 two we had pulled out. And I had put the one girl
- 11 on her side, and I started screaming again. I was
- 12 on this side of the tent. I remember looking over
- 13 and seeing like I -- what I've seen in movies of --
- 14 I felt like I was in the military and calling for
- 15 medic, medic.
- 16 When you see a battlefield going on and
- 17 everyone helping everyone else and somebody
- screaming, help me, help me, there's too much else 18
- 19 going on. No one is going to come help you.
- 20 That's how I felt. But my husband came.
- 21 Q. Okav.
- 22 And another lady came. And I -- that's
- the lady I thought was the nurse. And she came 23
- 24 over. And she looked at her, and she goes, she's
- 25 not breathing.

- And I said, I know.
 - And she said, what do we do?
- And at that same point, my husband came
- 4 up. And he said, call 9-1-1. Call an ambulance.
 - Q. Okay. And what did you do?
- 6 A. I -- the nurse lady said, ask Megan --
- 7 ask Megan if you can call an ambulance. And I
- 8 looked around for Megan, and I didn't see her right
- 9 off. So I ran over to where James Ray was sitting,
- 10 and I told him -- went up to him and said, there's
- 11 three people not breathing. We need to call an
- 12 ambulance. I need a phone. Where is Megan? You
- 13 know, in panic. We need a phone. We need to call
- 14 an ambulance.
- 15 Q. Did Mr. Ray respond?
- 16 A. Yes, he did.
- 17 Q. What did he say?
 - He said -- he didn't. He responded with
- 19 emotion, not a word.
 - Q. And so what did you do?
 - I turned around, and I saw Amayra, the
- 22 owner of the property, and my husband -- I heard
- 23 him yell at her, Amayra, call an ambulance. And I
- 24 saw her turn the other way and go another
- 25 direction.

197

1

2

5

18

20

21

1

2

5

11

14

- Q. And so what did you do?
- Α. I went to call an ambulance.
- 3 Where did you go to call an ambulance?
- 4 Α. To the house I was renting at the time.
 - How did you get to the house?
- 6 Α. I got in the golf cart and drove over
- 7 there.
- 8 Q. You mentioned a conversation with a
- person that you thought was a nurse. Who was that
- 10 person? Do you know her name?
 - A. Uh-uh.
- 12 Q. What -- do you recall how that person was
- dressed that day? 13
 - Α. They were in a Dream Team shirt.
- 15 Q. Why did you believe that person was a
- 16 nurse?
- 17 Α. I can't -- somebody told me that she was.
- But I couldn't tell you who told me that she was.
- 19 I wasn't even sure she was actually.
- 20 How far did you go have to go to call for
- help -- call for an ambulance? 21
- 22 I'm going to put up on the overhead the
- 23 map of Angel Valley, which is Exhibit 140. Can you
- 24 show the jury where you went.
- 25 It's kind of a glary right there, but I

- 11 Q. Where did you make the second phone call
- from? 12
- Α. 13 Somewhere in between this area here. I
- 14 was driving in the golf cart, and I made it on a
- 15 cell phone.
- Q. 16 Whose cell phone?
- 17 Α. Ted's.
- Q. Where did you get Ted's cell phone? 18
- 19 Α. From my house.
- 20 Q. Why did you make a second -- is that a
- 21 second 9-1-1 call?
- 22 Α. Yes.
- 23 Q. And why did you make a second call?
- 24 Α. Because I wanted them to be sure they
- sent more than one ambulance. I wanted them to 25

11 admission.

12

14

18

- MR. KELLY: That is correct.
- 13 THE COURT: Okav. 672 is admitted.
 - (Exhibit 672 admitted.)
- 15 BY MS. POLK: Ms. Mercer, we just have
- 16 about five more minutes, and then we're going to
- 17 take the recess for the day.
 - Α. Okav.
- 19 **Q.** Where was the nearest phone to the sweat
- 20 lodge? Do you know?
- 21 A. I can tell you where you the phones were.
- 22 I don't know what distances.
 - Q. Okay. Well, why did you go up to your
- 24 house to call?
- I don't know. 25

21

22

23

24

20

21

22

23

24

25

Α.

Q.

Α.

Q.

Yes.

out?

Liz Neuman.

And are you sure of that?

You mean the third person that we pulled

No. I don't know who that was.

There's a storm that's predicted for this

Again, remember all aspects of the

evening starting anytime, I guess. So take care.

I know some of you come a pretty long distance.

admonition. Take care. And we will start again

Tuesday, 9:15. Please be assembled at that time.

```
And, Ms. Mercer, I've reminded you several times. We've gone into the rule of exclusion. Of course, you must follow that.

And we will be in recess. Thank you. (The proceedings concluded.)
```

```
STATE OF ARIZONA
                                 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
    COUNTY OF YAVAPAI
               I, Mina G Hunt, do hereby certify that I
     am a Certified Reporter within the State of Arizona
    and Certified Shorthand Reporter in California
               I further certify that these proceedings
    were taken in shorthand by me at the time and place
    herein set forth, and were thereafter reduced to
    typewritten form, and that the foregoing
    constitutes a true and correct transcript
11
               I further certify that I am not related
    to, employed by, nor of counsel for any of the
13
    parties or attorneys herein, nor otherwise
14
    interested in the result of the within action
15
               In witness whereof, I have affixed my
    signature this 19th day of April, 2011
17
19
20
21
22
23
                MINA G HUNT, AZ CR NO 50619
CA CSR NO 8335
24
25
```

1	STATE OF ARIZONA)) ss: REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
2) ss: REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE COUNTY OF YAVAPAI)
3	
4	I, Mina G. Hunt, do hereby certify that I
5	am a Certified Reporter within the State of Arizona
6	and Certified Shorthand Reporter in California.
7	I further certify that these proceedings
8	were taken in shorthand by me at the time and place
9	herein set forth, and were thereafter reduced to
10	typewritten form, and that the foregoing
11	constitutes a true and correct transcript.
12	I further certify that I am not related
13	to, employed by, nor of counsel for any of the
14	parties or attorneys herein, nor otherwise
15	interested in the result of the within action.
16	In witness whereof, I have affixed my
17	signature this 19th day of April, 2011.
18	
19	
20	
21	,
22	
23	MINA G. HUNT, AZ CR No. 50619
24	CA CSR No. 8335
25	